United Nations A/50/PV.46

General Assembly

Fiftieth Session

Official Records

46th plenary meeting

Wednesday, 1 November 1995, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Freitas do Amaral . . . . (Portugal)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

Agenda item 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council: report of the Second Committee (Part I) (A/50/615)

The Acting President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Assembly will now turn to Part I of the report (A/50/615) of the Second Committee on agenda item 12, "Report of the Economic and Social Council", dealing with revision of the General Regulations of the World Food Programme and reconstitution of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes as the Executive Board of the World Food Programme.

In this connection, I should like to draw the attention of members to a note by the Secretary-General on the same subject, which is contained in document A/50/706.

I request the Rapporteur of the Second Committee, Mr. Basheer Zoubi of Jordan, to introduce the report of the Second Committee.

Mr. Zoubi (Jordan), Rapporteur of the Second Committee: I have the honour to present part I of the report of the Second Committee on agenda item 12, entitled "Report of the Economic and Social Council", which is contained in document A/50/615.

In paragraph 5 of this document, the Second Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution entitled "Revision of the General Regulations of the World Food Programme and reconstitution of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes as the Executive Board of the World Food Programme". The draft resolution was adopted by the Committee without a vote.

The Acting President (*interpretation from Arabic*): Before taking action on the draft resolution, I wish to point out that paragraph 1 would have the General Assembly decide, *inter alia*, subject to the concurrence of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), to reconstitute the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes as the Executive Board of the World Food Programme.

In that connection, as indicated by the Secretary-General in document A/50/706, the twenty-eighth session of the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) adopted on Tuesday, 31 October 1995, by consensus, a resolution parallel to the draft resolution now before the Assembly. In that resolution, the FAO Conference decided, subject to the concurrence of the Assembly, that the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes should be reconstituted as the Executive Board of the World Food Programme.

If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

decides not to discuss the report of the Second Committee which is before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The Acting President (*interpretation from Arabic*): Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the recommendation of the Second Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendation contained in the report of the Second Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take a decision in the same manner as was done in the Committee.

The Assembly has before it a draft resolution which is contained in paragraph 5 of Part I of the report of the Second Committee (A/50/615). The draft resolution is entitled "Revision of the General Regulations of the World Food Programme and reconstitution of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes as the Executive Board of the World Food Programme".

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended for adoption by the Second Committee in paragraph 5 of its report. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 50/8).

The Acting President (*interpretation from Arabic*): The General Assembly has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of agenda item 12.

Agenda item 133

Financing of the United Nations Mission in Haiti: report of the Fifth Committee (A/50/705)

The Acting President (*interpretation from Arabic*): If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the Assembly decides not to discuss the report of the Fifth Committee that is before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The Acting President (*interpretation from Arabic*): Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote. The positions of delegations regarding the recommendation of the Fifth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendation contained in the report of the Fifth Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take a decision in the same manner as was done in the Fifth Committee.

The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 5 of its report (A/50/705). The draft decision was adopted by the Fifth Committee without a vote.

May I consider that the Assembly too wishes to adopt the draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted.

The Acting President (*interpretation from Arabic*): We have thus concluded this stage of our consideration of agenda item 133.

Agenda item 14

Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency

Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Agency (A/50/360)

Draft resolution (A/50/L.11)

Amendment (A/50/L.12)

The Acting President (*interpretation from Arabic*): Before calling on the first speaker, I should like to propose that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed today at noon.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to this proposal.

It was so decided.

The Acting President (*interpretation from Arabic*): I therefore request representatives wishing to participate in the debate to place their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible.

I now invite the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Mr. Hans Blix, to present the report of the Agency for the year 1994.

Mr. Blix (Director General, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)): On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations it might be appropriate to review some of the main achievements and challenges facing the international community in the field of competence of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which was created to foster international cooperation in the field of the peaceful and safe use of nuclear energy.

International efforts to promote the peaceful application of nuclear energy and to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons have resulted in the non-proliferation regime, with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) at its centre and with the IAEA providing the function of verifying compliance with non-proliferation pledges.

In May of this year the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the NPT decided to extend the Treaty indefinitely. That decision underlined the broad and solid commitment of the then 178 Parties to the Treaty. In my view, the extension decision, and the Principles and Objectives and the strengthened review process that were also adopted should be read as a collective commitment to the exclusively peaceful use of nuclear energy and to the renunciation of nuclear weapons, a commitment by non-nuclear-weapon States not to acquire such weapons and a commitment by the weapon States to nuclear disarmament with the ultimate goal of eliminating these weapons.

The outcome of the NPT Conference has far-reaching implications for the future work of the IAEA. The Agency's role as a centre for international cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy was confirmed, and the IAEA was expressly recognized as the competent authority responsible for verifying compliance with safeguards agreements. The Conference called on Parties to the NPT with concerns regarding non-compliance with safeguards agreements to direct such concerns, along with supporting evidence and information, to the IAEA for it to consider, investigate, draw conclusions and decide on necessary actions in accordance with its mandate. The Conference further called for support for the Agency's efforts to strengthen safeguards and to develop its capability to detect possible undeclared nuclear activities. I take this as a sign of trust in the Agency's existing role in the field of verification.

The Conference also expressed its support for an expanded the IAEA role in verification. It recommended that nuclear material released from military use should be placed under the IAEA safeguards as soon as practicable and that safeguards should be universally applied once the elimination of nuclear weapons has been completed.

The NPT Conference called for the early conclusion of an agreement to end the production of nuclear material for weapons or other nuclear explosive devices and endorsed the creation of additional nuclear-weapon-free zones. It also set 1996 as the target date for the completion of a nuclear test ban, universally recognized as a vital component of the non-proliferation regime and an important step towards nuclear disarmament. There is an emerging consensus that the IAEA safeguards would be an essential element on the verification of a cut-off agreement. It is also be expected, if the existing nuclear-weapon-free-zone agreements are an indication, that the Agency would have a verification role in any future nuclear-weapon-free zone.

With regard to a comprehensive test ban, it is relevant to note that such a ban — verified by the IAEA — is already in force for the more than 170 non-nuclear-weapon States that have accepted comprehensive IAEA safeguards on all their nuclear activities. These States are obliged not to use any nuclear material for explosions, and the IAEA safeguards are required to verify that this obligation is respected. What role the Agency might be asked to assume under a comprehensive test-ban treaty is still a matter of discussion at the Conference on Disarmament at Geneva. Entrusting the IAEA with the function of verifying a comprehensive test-ban treaty would undoubtedly save resources, which would seem natural at a time when efforts are urged to avoid duplication, overlap and unnecessary cost in the United Nations family. It would also permit more rapid implementation.

Credible IAEA verification of States' compliance with their nuclear-arms-control pledges is becoming an increasingly important factor in global security and nuclear disarmament. The lessons of Iraq and the increasing demands placed on the IAEA safeguards have necessitated the strengthening of the safeguards system and making it more cost-effective. In particular, Governments and the public now demand that the IAEA safeguards system should have the capacity to detect any secret, undeclared nuclear material and installations. There is also a greater understanding and readiness to accept that such verification must include no-notice inspections, greater freedom of movement for the inspectors and use of the most modern means of detection and communication.

The Agency's efforts to develop a strengthened safeguards system have focused on three essential elements: first, increased access to information about a State's nuclear activities; secondly, broader access to sites and locations within a State; and, thirdly, maximum use of new and available technologies to increase detection capacity and, in due course, to reduce the frequency of on-site inspections. I am pleased to note that the Agency's Board of Governors has already accepted the first part of the Agency programme to strengthen its safeguards system, the so-called Programme "93 + 2". The secretariat is in a position to implement these new measures after the required consultation with Member States. The second part of the programme, which relates to measures requiring additional legal authority, is due for consideration by the Agency's Board of Governors within a few months. The test of any new measure is that it enhances the effectiveness of the system and is cost-effective. Experience gained in field trials of some of the new measures suggests that they can be implemented without much additional intrusion or cost to States.

On the other hand, a significant increase in the IAEA verification efforts in terms of cost and resources may result if nuclear material released from the military programmes of nuclear-weapon States is placed under the IAEA safeguards, as urged by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Verification of some such material released from the weapons programme of the United States was started a year ago. These expanded efforts would require new arrangements to ensure that the released material would permanently remain under safeguards and that the financing of such verification was assured.

Last year I reported that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) was not in full compliance with its safeguards agreement pursuant to the NPT. This continues to be the case. In the framework that was agreed between the DPRK and the United States on 21 October 1994, the DPRK agreed to freeze and eventually dismantle its graphite-moderated reactors and related facilities and stated its intention eventually to come into full compliance with the safeguards agreement. As the Assembly is aware, the Security Council, confirming that the DPRK safeguards agreement remains in force and binding, requested the Agency to take the necessary steps to monitor the freeze. With the authorization of the Board, we have been doing this, *inter alia*, through the maintenance of a continuous presence of Agency inspectors in the DPRK. I can confirm that the freeze has been put into effect and has been maintained to date. For the DPRK to come into full compliance with the safeguards agreement, however, it must enable the Agency to verify effectively the accuracy and completeness of its declaration of nuclear material subject to safeguards. Until this cooperation — long overdue — comes about, it is essential that all necessary steps be taken to preserve information that may be relevant to the eventual verification of the DPRK's initial declaration.

Technical meetings have been held with the DPRK on a number of occasions to discuss activities that are required by the Agency for it to fulfil its obligations under the safeguards agreement, including monitoring the freeze. Since the first of these discussions in November last year, arrangements have been made which enable the Agency to meet many of its obligations. However, a number of issues remain to be resolved, including the measures required for the preservation of information.

Let me now turn to Iraq. As I reported to the General Assembly last year, it is our conclusion that the essential components of Iraq's clandestine nuclear-weapon programme have been identified and destroyed, removed or rendered harmless. This assessment was based not on faith in Iraqi statements but on data gathered during inspection, on information provided by the suppliers and Member States and, to a great extent, on analysis of the large number of original documents which were obtained in Iraq early in the inspection process. Since August 1994 the IAEA inspectors have been continuously present in Iraq to carry out ongoing monitoring and verification of Iraq's compliance with the relevant Security Council resolutions. This does not exclude the further conduct of inspections for the purpose of investigation, should such an investigation be called for, for example to verify new information.

Recently, the IAEA received additional information on Iraq's former nuclear-weapons programme by way of new declarations, voluminous documents and other materials which were transmitted to the IAEA and the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) by Iraq following the departure of the former Iraqi Minister of Industry and Military Industrialization. What we have been told is that in 1990 Iraqi authorities instituted a crash project to take safeguarded highly enriched research reactor fuel and transform the fissile material for use in a nuclear weapon. It is uncertain whether Iraq would have been able to overcome the considerable technical difficulties involved in this project. As it was, the project was made impossible by damage inflicted on the nuclear research centre at Tuwaitha by the January 1991 bombing, and the safeguarded nuclear fuel was fully accounted for in the IAEA post-war inspection. The new Iraqi declarations, along with all the documents and materials to which I have referred, are currently being carefully examined for any new data. What can be concluded at this stage is that Iraq's withholding of information, documents and materials clearly constitutes a breach of Iraqi obligations under Security Council resolutions and that the crash programme was in violation of the safeguards agreement and the NPT.

As requested last year by the Agency's General Conference, the Agency has continued to assist the African States in their effort to establish an African nuclear-weapon-free zone and in particular to help elaborate its verification regime. A draft treaty text which, *inter alia*, entrusts the Agency with the task of verification was adopted by the African Heads of State in Addis Ababa last June and is now before the General Assembly. We look forward to performing the verification role in an African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

The General Conference of the IAEA continues to call upon all parties directly concerned in the Middle East to consider taking the practical and appropriate steps required to establish a mutually and effectively verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East region This year's resolution again requested the Director General to continue consultations with the States of the Middle East to facilitate the early application of full-scope Agency safeguards to all nuclear activities in the region and the preparation of model verification agreements as a step toward the establishment of such a zone. I intend to continue my visits to and consultations with States in the region in order further to explore the verification questions and the material obligations which may be agreed upon and which may call for verification.

For the last two years the international community has been expressing alarm at the number of incidents of illicit trafficking in nuclear materials as well as other radioactive sources. Although the reported cases in 1995 show a decreasing trend, this is no cause for complacency. It is clear that greater efforts are needed and that States must pay increased attention to the physical protection of all radioactive material — and especially weapons-useable nuclear material — whether in use, transport or storage. While the primary responsibility in the field of illegal trafficking falls upon the State concerned, authorities in many countries, as well as a number of international organizations, are seeking to strengthen and coordinate their efforts to better protect and control radioactive materials. The IAEA has recently hosted a large inter-agency meeting for that purpose.

Within the IAEA, a plan of action has been put in place. The Agency is establishing a data base of trafficking incidents to provide factual information to Member States' Governments and to the public. Further, as effective national accounting and protection is the basic prerequisite for preventing nuclear material from falling into unauthorized hands, the Agency is conducting training courses in the implementation of State systems of accounting and control of nuclear material and in physical protection methods and technology. With the assistance of many donor countries, the Agency has also coordinated technical support efforts in the upgrading of physical protection of nuclear material in the newly independent States of the former Soviet Union.

Since the Chernobyl accident, the Agency's role in the field of nuclear safety has been gradually expanding. In addition to the sharing of information and the development of safety guidelines and standards, the Agency has moved progressively in the field of providing advisory services to member States, such as the Operational Safety Advisory Review Teams, which provide expert services in assessing and advising on operational safety of power reactors, and the Analysis of Safety-Significant Events Teams. Agency work on assessment of the safety of nuclear power plants in Eastern Europe and countries of the former Soviet Union has continued; an international consensus now exists on the major safety issues and their significance for each of the various reactor types. The emphasis is now shifting to a review of the status of implementation of the proposed safety improvements and to the collection of up-to-date information on the upgrading situation at each of the reactors involved. The results of our work provide input into bilateral and multilateral assistance projects coordinated by the G-24 mechanisms in Brussels.

The decision to operate — or not to operate — a reactor is a national prerogative. The IAEA has not been given any supranational competence in this regard. However, the Agency continues to provide, upon request, expert advice on the safety of reactors and on safety improvements needed. On some occasions the Agency has advised that it would be imprudent for a particular reactor to operate unless safety improvements were ensured.

No nuclear accident has been the subject of more analysis, as regards both its causes and its consequences, than the one at Chernobyl. Even so — or perhaps precisely for this reason — the accounts and explanations vary considerably, especially as to the radiological impact of the accident on the health of the affected people and the environment. It is evidently desirable that this impact be scientifically established, as is the radiological impact of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki nuclear bombs. On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the tragic accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, in April 1996, the Agency, and several other organizations — for instance, the World Health Organization and the European Union — are organizing in April next year an international conference to seek a common understanding of the nature and magnitude of the consequences of that accident. Let me add, however, that while such understanding is highly desirable, there is no reason for anybody to delay action and assistance to alleviate the situation of the people concerned. Many enquiries following the Chernobyl accident have documented the distressing situation in which they live.

In the field of nuclear power safety, the IAEA has long issued recommendations based on best experience and practice. More recently the Agency has also moved to develop binding international safety standards. This is a clear manifestation of the increased interest of the international community that nuclear safety be at a high level everywhere. There is a growing realization that an accident anywhere is an accident everywhere. A major accomplishment was the adoption in June last year of the Convention on Nuclear Safety. So far the Convention has been signed by 59 States. It may be expected to enter into force next year. This month representatives of signatories of the Convention and other interested States will hold their second meeting to discuss matters relating to the implementation process.

Still in the field of nuclear safety and security, let me note that these subjects will be taken up at a summit meeting to be hosted in Russia next spring. It is to be hoped that the summit will give political impetus to work in the field of nuclear safety and security, thereby reducing risks and making nuclear power more broadly acceptable to the public.

Nuclear waste disposal remains a major concern among the public in many countries. This concern might lessen when Governments and industry have actually established repositories for wastes of different levels of radioactivity. From the scientific and technical standpoint there are no serious obstacles to the building of repositories which remain safe for extremely long periods of time. The selection of disposal sites, however, often meets with opposition. We can only place our faith in the effect of rational argument. An open dialogue with the public is required. The IAEA continues to be active in the field of radioactive waste management, including providing assistance to developing States in building up infrastructures for waste management, and promoting the minimization, safe processing, storage and disposal of radioactive wastes. I am pleased to report that work has already started on the preparation of a convention on the safe management of radioactive waste, providing binding standards. Significant progress has been made, and it is to be hoped that a final draft could perhaps be ready some time next year.

One of the greatest challenges facing the international community is to find the proper means of providing sufficient energy for sustainable development — that is to say providing energy without unacceptable damage to the environment. Experts have concluded that goals to stabilize carbon dioxide emissions at 1990 levels are not attainable by the year 2000 under present conditions. In national action reports prepared by parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change many countries report that they will not achieve the goals that they have set for themselves, goals that they have already agreed are not adequate for the long term. Indeed, looking around the world we can easily see how the need for development and the correlated need for greater energy use is leading to the construction of ever more installations burning coal, oil and gas. Extensive analysis of energy options is clearly needed if we are to resolve the dilemma between development and preservation of the environment.

It is not very meaningful to analyse the economic and ecological aspects of any given energy option in isolation. All sources and uses of energy have their risks — as, indeed, an absence of energy carries risks. Only an analysis of different options side by side can tell us which energy policy is economically and ecologically least burdensome. The IAEA is cooperating with several international organizations in drawing up methodologies and data bases for comparative assessment of different options for the production of electric power. An international symposium addressed this issue in Vienna last month. This is an area where difficult policy decisions must be taken. Governments need to devise long-term energy policies that are economically and ecologically acceptable. Solar power, wind power, biomass and other renewables will bring a valuable but minor contribution to the global energy supply within the next few decades. There is scope for more efficient energy use, and it should be promoted. However, in most places it will not offset the need for additional energy and it is evident that developing countries will need energy in much greater amounts. There are no new energy sources on the horizon that can magically meet these needs. Fusion is still very distant.

Expansion of nuclear power, which now provides about 8 per cent of the world's energy and 17 per cent of its electricity, could provide a part of the solution on the supply side without increasing emissions of carbon dioxide, sulphur dioxide or nitrogen oxides. The main obstacle to increased use of nuclear energy is public concern with safety, radioactive waste and non-proliferation. Any particular energy mix chosen has to be based on comparative risk assessment of the various sources of energy and will need to be thoroughly explained to the public. The IAEA, for its part, will continue to make available the data that are relevant in this regard, and factual information relevant to nuclear safety, radioactive waste management and non-proliferation.

Few developing countries have a technological level and infrastructure that would allow them to make use of the present type of nuclear power reactors. It is to be hoped that, in the future, smaller and less costly nuclear reactors will become available for use by developing countries for the generation of electricity and perhaps also in the desalination of water to compensate for scarce fresh water resources. Developing countries members of the IAEA are keenly interested in these questions. It is obvious that the rapidly increasing number of cities with more than a million, even more than 10 million, inhabitants in developing countries cannot be provided with electricity generated by, say, solar cells, windmills or biomass. Their real choice for decades to come will be between fossil fuels and nuclear power.

At present, only a few developing countries use nuclear power. However, most of them are intensely interested in non-power nuclear techniques that may help their development, and the IAEA is engaged in assisting the transfer of such techniques. Emphasis is being placed on techniques that will contribute to sustainable development, food production and preservation, the harnessing of freshwater resources, industrial uses and the promotion of human health. The Agency has recently undertaken several initiatives to strengthen its technical cooperation programme and to make it more effective and more relevant to sustainable development. Working together with member States, the secretariat has started preparing country programme frameworks which will help to focus the technical cooperation programmes on key areas of Government priority, with fewer but better-focused projects. Another measure planned is the promotion of technical cooperation among developing countries, with the aim of subcontracting institutions in developing countries recognized as centres of excellence in a particular field to implement selected technical cooperation projects.

At the Review and Extension Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, all participants acknowledged the importance of the work of the Agency as the principal instrument for the transfer of nuclear technology to developing countries, and welcomed the successful operation of the Agency's technical assistance and cooperation programmes. It was also recognized that the success of these programmes depends on the availability of predictable resources. I sincerely hope that the States members of the Agency will pay their contributions to the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Fund in full and in time to enable the Agency to continue to perform its development mission successfully.

During this fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations I cannot close my statement to the General Assembly without some comments on coordination within the United Nations family of organizations and on effectiveness and efficiency. In both respects, severe criticism has been voiced.

That coordination is difficult in a vast system of organizations, authorities and administrations is no novelty to national Governments, many of which have experience of similar problems, though they have the advantage of a central Government and a legislature. Within the United Nations family, action by the Economic and Social Council and the Administrative Committee on Coordination, and under informal contacts and arrangements, can help to harmonize activities and prevent some overlap. The most important contacts between the IAEA and the United Nations occur in cases of non-compliance with safeguards agreements. The cases of Iraq and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea have given us much experience in cooperation.

The Administrative Committee on Coordination, under the chairmanship of the Secretary-General, is increasingly — and, I think, with some success — trying to ensure effective system-wide responses in matters such as sustainable development, African development and the role of women, that are relevant in all or most organizations. The technique, recently employed, of indicating lead agencies for certain questions may prove helpful.

Effective action by organizations in the United Nations family is in many cases directly dependent on the degree of cooperation that can be achieved between Member States. However, there is also much action that is undertaken mainly by the secretariats. Here, effectiveness depends largely upon the same factors as those which influence efficiency: the availability of adequate and predictable resources, the cooperation of States that may be affected, and — last but not least — the competence and skill of management and staff in the secretariats. We stand or fall on the quality of our management and staff. This is true of the IAEA and, I am sure, of the other organizations in the United Nations family.

The Agency has some unique features, which continue to serve us well in staffing, but which may also deter some qualified experts from joining us. Professional staff in the IAEA are not recruited for a career, but for a period of five to seven years. This policy of rotation has been followed to ensure a continuous influx of talents fresh from laboratories, nuclear installations and other institutions — talents abreast of the latest developments in their field. To have the respect and cooperation of the experts with whom our staff interact in member States, our professional staff must be on a par with the national experts.

I am not suggesting that there is a direct correlation between remuneration and work delivery. However, there is not the slightest doubt that when the pros and cons of employment in an international organization are being weighed, remuneration, home leave, education grants for children, pension benefits, and so on, have a very significant impact on potential candidates and, hence, on our ability to recruit staff of the highest calibre.

In this regard, the IAEA and other organizations are dependent upon the so-called United Nations common system of remuneration, to which we have adhered. This system, as it now stands, falls short on several counts. Let me give the Assembly just a few illustrations. We have general service staff who turn down offers of posts at the professional level because acceptance would lower their salary. Since 1984, professional remuneration in Vienna has lost about 20 per cent of its purchasing power. A senior energy economist who goes from the Agency to the World Bank may expect a salary 40 per cent higher; a safeguards inspector who leaves the Agency, in Vienna, for the European Atomic Energy Community, in Luxembourg, may expect his income to increase by at least a third. We do not know how many candidates refrain from applying for a job in the Agency because they are offered better conditions elsewhere, but we know that only 4 to 6 per cent of those who currently apply for jobs with us meet our exacting recruitment standards.

As Director General of the IAEA, I joined other executive heads in issuing a statement, recently adopted by the Administrative Committee on Coordination, which, *inter alia*, endorses the salary increases recommended by the International Civil Service Commission. These would bring United Nations remuneration into the middle of the margin range approved by the General Assembly. However, such a step — in itself urgently needed — would subsequently have to be supplemented by a longer-term strategy of restoring competitiveness.

An improvement in the remuneration system is not a panacea for all the management problems that United Nations organizations face. It might even look to some an odd response to a critical financial situation and to sharp criticism for waste and inefficiency. I would submit, however, that the remuneration system is part of the present problem. Unless management is given the ability and freedom to recruit professional staff of the highest calibre, from anywhere in the world — and this can be done only if remuneration is internationally competitive and if Governments refrain from interfering in a fair selection process — it will be hard, if not impossible, to achieve the continuous improvement in quality and efficiency that is rightly called for in the secretariats of United Nations organizations.

I am sorry to bring these mundane matters before delegations, but this body — the General Assembly — not only lays down political guidance for us in Vienna but also decides on employment and other conditions that directly affect our ability and that of other international organizations to fulfil the mandates they have been given.

Let me end on a positive note by telling the Assembly that Vienna, although in some respects an expensive city, is an excellent work station, and the

Austrian Government and the city of Vienna the friendliest of hosts.

The Acting President: I call on the representative of the Netherlands to introduce draft resolution A/50/L.11.

Mr. Dumoré (Netherlands): It is my honour and pleasure to present draft resolution A/50/L.11, on the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency, on behalf of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

The traditional General Assembly resolution on the annual report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is about the Agency's recent and prospective activities and is meant to endorse these important activities as well as to comment on them. In this introduction, I will only point out the few changes from General Assembly resolution 49/65 that have been incorporated into this new draft resolution.

The third preambular paragraph is a new paragraph that has been lifted *in toto* from the NPT Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament in order to introduce more consensus language with regard to safeguards into the text.

The ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 7 have been inserted into the text to bring it into line with the consensus language stemming from the General Conference of the Agency in Vienna.

The tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 6 also represent an update of the resolution based on developments and General Conference resolutions in Vienna.

The twelfth preambular paragraph takes account of GC(39)/RES/20 and deals with women in the secretariat; this is an addition inspired by the recent Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing.

It is important that the resolution on the Agency's annual report attract wide support. All Agency member States have common interests in ensuring that the work of the Agency in all areas — including safeguards, technical assistance, radiation safety, and so on — receives due recognition. The cosponsors of draft resolution A/50/L.11 believe that this annual resolution is particularly helpful for the important work performed by the International Atomic Energy Agency in all fields, and recommend that it be adopted with the broadest possible support in its original, unamended form.

Mr. Laclaustra (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania and the Slovak Republic associate themselves with this statement.

At the outset, I wish to express our gratitude for the work carried out by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in 1994 and to date in 1995, as described in its annual report for 1994 and in the additional information just provided by the Director General of the IAEA. We commend the Director General and the secretariat of the Agency for their efforts, which have made possible an expanded programme despite limited resources.

The European Union is aware of the importance of the various elements that make up the programme of work of the IAEA in accordance with its statutory functions, in particular in the field of non-proliferation, the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the strengthening of the international cooperation on nuclear safety, radiological protection and waste management. The European Union wishes to make a few specific comments on these areas and on the general management of the IAEA.

Starting with non-proliferation, we should like first to recall the many achievements of the international community in this field during this period, which are a source of great satisfaction for the European Union.

The indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) has unquestionably been a decisive landmark on the path towards the attainment of a stable legal framework to stem the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The decision on principles and objectives, also adopted by the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the NPT, deserves special attention because it refers specifically to the IAEA, and in particular to the safeguards regime and the peaceful use of nuclear energy. The principles recognize that the IAEA is the competent authority responsible for verifying and ensuring compliance with its safeguards agreements with States parties, with a view to preventing the diversion of nuclear energy from peaceful uses to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. The principles also state that the Agency's capability to detect undeclared nuclear activities should be increased and that every effort should be made to ensure that the Agency has the financial and human resources necessary to meet effectively its responsibilities in the areas of technical cooperation, safeguards and nuclear safety.

Great progress has also been achieved on the path to greater universality of the NPT. The European Union welcomes the accession of Ukraine to the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State, as well as the accessions of 12 other States. Nevertheless, a small number of States continue to remain outside the fundamental norms that govern nuclear non-proliferation. I therefore appeal once again, on behalf of the European Union, to all these States — in particular those that operate unsafeguarded nuclear facilities — to accede to the Treaty.

Although considerable progress has been made in the prevention of nuclear proliferation, important challenges must still be faced in the near future, such as the conclusion no later than 1996 of an internationally and effectively verifiable zero-yield comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The conclusion of a treaty on a the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices — the so-called cut-off treaty — is another European Union priority in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. We also support the creation of new, internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones, in accordance with the aforementioned principles and objectives approved by the NPT Review and Extension Conference.

As regards the IAEA safeguards, the European Union considers that strengthening the system by means of measures derived from the "93+2" Programme is a key priority. The Union expresses its satisfaction with the progress achieved in this field, in particular with the fact that the Board of Governors, at its meeting last June, urged States parties to comprehensive safeguards agreements to cooperate in the implementation of measures that constitute the first phase of the Programme. The European Union hopes for the timely implementation of these measures and will cooperate to that end.

As to the group of measures that constitute the second phase of the Programme, their broad outlines were endorsed last March by the Board of Governors. The European Union is prepared to engage in further consultations with the secretariat of the IAEA on the measures to be taken in this phase, and is looking forward to cooperating in carrying out such consultations. The European Union hopes that, as a result of this process of consultation, concrete proposals on measures for States with comprehensive safeguards agreements will be presented to the Board of Governors of the IAEA.

Regarding the implementation of safeguards in 1994, the European Union supports the conclusions reached by the Director General of the IAEA. Concerning Iraq, the European Union notes with satisfaction the results attained in dismantling its clandestine nuclear programme as well as in implementing the permanent Plan for control and verification of compliance with resolutions of the Security Council. Nevertheless, long-term success can be ensured only if Iraq continues to cooperate fully with the IAEA.

The European Union welcomes the advances made in the implementation of the Agreed Framework between the United States and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). However, the European Union regrets that the DPRK still does not consider itself fully bound by its safeguards agreement with the IAEA and is not complying with its legal obligations under that agreement. This remains a matter of grave concern. In this respect, we welcome the resolution adopted by the last General Conference of the IAEA.

The potential for illicit trafficking in nuclear materials continues to give cause for general concern. The Union has actively participated in defining an international strategy to tackle this problem, within the IAEA framework. The existence of effective national accountancy and control systems, especially in those countries possessing sensitive nuclear material, and the existence of systems to ensure physical protection are crucial elements in fighting illicit trafficking.

Turning now to the activities of the Agency in the field of nuclear safety and radiological protection, the European Union would like first to express its satisfaction at the adoption and signature in 1994 of the Convention on Nuclear Safety, and its hope that the Convention will soon enter into force.

The European Union also welcomes the progress achieved in the safe management of radioactive waste, which has paved the way for the drafting of a convention on the safety of radioactive waste management.

Among the many important activities carried out by the IAEA in the area of nuclear safety and radiological protection, one is of special interest to the European Union: the extrabudgetary programme for the safety of WWER and RMBK type reactors, to which the European Union makes a large financial contribution. The European Union provides firm support also for ensuring greater safety for these reactors, as is proved by its many contributions both bilaterally and through the PHARE and TACIS Programmes.

The broad range of contributions which the European Union makes every year to the IAEA technical cooperation programme is visible proof of the great importance it attaches to this matter.

A review of the information on the technical-cooperation activities for 1994 makes clear the magnitude of the work undertaken by the Secretariat of the Agency, which deserves praise, especially if one bears in mind the fact that it has had to develop its activities in the context of limited resources. Even so, this has not prevented a large increase in the technical assistance provided, as expressed in new net obligations. On the other hand, in the current resource situation it is even more important for the IAEA to continue to focus on ensuring that available resources are used effectively.

Looking now to future activities of the Agency, the European Union is of the opinion that a greater effort is needed to set priorities and to introduce stringent evaluation methods into all such activities. This will entail difficult decisions in order to ensure that all ineffective or low-priority programmes are eliminated, which will facilitate the financing of new programmes that are really necessary.

Looking further ahead, the time has come for the Agency to carry out the preparatory work needed to determine the directions and magnitude of its activities beyond the year 2000. The major new factors in this exercise will be the need to fully implement Programme "93+2", as well as the new responsibilities that could be assigned to the Agency in relation to future international treaties, such as the comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty and the so-called cut-off convention, on the prohibition of the production of fissile materials for weapons purposes.

The European Union supports the draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.11, just introduced by the representative of the Netherlands, and hopes that the General Assembly will also support it.

Mr. Maruyama (Japan): I should like to thank the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Mr. Hans Blix, for his comprehensive and clear report to the Assembly.

This has been a special year in view of the decision that was taken at the Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), here in New York last may to extend the NPT indefinitely. At the time, two documents were also adopted — namely, "Strengthening the Review Process for the Treaty" and "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament". Further, it was reconfirmed that the IAEA has a very important role to play in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and in verifying and assuring compliance with safeguards agreements.

Before I proceed to specific topics concerning the activities of the IAEA during the past year, I would like to take this opportunity to briefly take up the issue of nuclear testing.

The NPT Conference set 1996 as a target date for the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty and stated in its decision that

> "Pending entry into force of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, the nuclear-weapon-States should exercise utmost restraint." *(NPT/CONF.1995/32 (Part I), Decision 2, para. 4 (a))*

Under these circumstances, the General Conference of the IAEA adopted without a vote a resolution which, *inter alia*, expressed grave concern at the resumption and the continuation of nuclear testing. My delegation believes that this resolution was a significant step in the process of concluding a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In this connection, I would like to note the suggestion that Vienna be made the seat of the organization for that treaty, inasmuch as the necessary expertise could be made available by the IAEA in Vienna to support the organization. My delegation thinks that the location of the treaty organization is a very important issue, and should be carefully considered during the negotiations on the treaty.

With regard to the suspected development of nuclear weapons by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Japan would like to reiterate that it welcomes the Agreed Framework, concluded in October 1994, between the United States and North Korea. Japan will continue to exert its utmost efforts to resolve this issue through its participation in the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO), which was established in March of this year. My Government has always supported the Director General and his staff in their ongoing and impartial efforts to implement the safeguards agreement between the IAEA and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), including efforts to monitor the freeze of specified facilities as requested by the Security Council.

The experiences of the IAEA in Iraq, as well as in North Korea, illustrate clearly the need to further strengthen the safeguards system. It is particularly important that the Agency improve its ability to detect undeclared nuclear development activities. The Agency has responded actively to this requirement. Japan supports the direction of Programme "93+2", which seeks to formulate measures to strengthen the effectiveness and improve the efficiency of the safeguards system.

The adoption last year of the Convention on Nuclear Safety was truly an epochal development. Japan deposited its instrument of acceptance of the Convention in May of this year, and hopes that many other States will likewise do so, in order that the Convention may enter into force without delay.

The safe management of radioactive waste is also important in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Japan will make positive contributions to the Agency's activities in this area, including its deliberations on a convention on the safety of radioactive waste management.

I wish to note in this regard that the Agency has been actively involved in the improvement of nuclear safety and the establishment of safeguards systems in countries of the former Soviet Union. Recognizing the importance of these activities of the Agency, Japan has contributed to them and believes they should be continued.

Japan also attaches great importance to the multilateral technical cooperation activities of the Agency and has actively contributed both human and financial resources to support them. Japan will continue to provide assistance to the best of its ability for the development and improvement of human resource skills in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that the Agency's achievements depend ultimately upon the firm support of member States. We must all do our best to further develop this important organization.

Ms. Tomová (Slovakia): At the outset I should like to say that we fully associate ourselves with the statement made by the representative of Spain on behalf of the European Union and associated countries.

The Slovak Republic deems the International Atomic Energy Agency to be a highly important international organization in the United Nations system. The IAEA plays an exceptionally significant role in verifying fulfilment of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and its safeguards system, as well as in the promotion of international cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Slovakia considers that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons fosters the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy by providing a framework of confidence within which those uses can take place. The indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty promotes stability, confidence and favourable conditions for the non-proliferation regime and nuclear disarmament.

Slovakia has noted with satisfaction that the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons reaffirmed the IAEA safeguards system as a key element of the Treaty for preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The IAEA plays an irreplaceable role in the observance of the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty through the safeguards system, with the aim of preventing the conversion of fissile material from peaceful uses to military purposes and of strengthening mutual confidence. During the recent period the safeguards system has justified itself. The IAEA safeguards provide an assurance that States are complying with their undertakings and assist them to demonstrate this compliance. Such safeguards play a significant role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other explosive devices.

Slovakia strictly fulfils its obligations under its full-scope safeguards agreement with the IAEA. As far as accounting is concerned, the owners of nuclear materials are obliged to keep exact records of the amounts, imports, exports, storage sites, consumption and transport in terms of the requirements of the IAEA and the Slovak Republic's Nuclear Regulatory Authority.

We have supported the IAEA's Programme "93+2" on strengthening and improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the safeguards system. The Programme represents the utilization of modern, advanced verification techniques for better confidence-building in future. With the aim of implementing a more effective safeguards system, Slovakia supports the application of greater nuclear transparency, environmental monitoring, the expanded right to prompt access to information and sites, and short notice or notice inspections. We call for closer cooperation with the Agency. The case of Iraq is not the only case to highlight the need for the Agency to strengthen safeguards. With expanding nuclear disarmament and arms-control measures, all countries will demand highly credible verification in the nuclear field to provide assurances that declarations on nuclear material and installations are correct and complete and that nothing has been forgotten or hidden. Regarding the violation of commitments by Iraq, we strongly urge the Iraqi authorities to cooperate fully in the implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions and the activities of the Agency's Action Team. We also appeal to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to cooperate fully with the Agency in its monitoring and safeguarding role.

Slovakia considers that measures to strengthen the safeguards system, effective and transparent multilateral export control, and activities aimed at preventing illicit trafficking in nuclear materials should be interconnected. We welcome the IAEA's efforts to help member States to meet their responsibilities in regard to the control of nuclear material. The IAEA safeguards should be an essential element of the verification of a ban on the production of fissile material for nuclear explosive devices. We regret that progress on a cut-off agreement appears to be slow.

An inseparable part of the nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament issue is the comprehensive test-ban treaty (CTBT). The CTBT should put in place a cost-effective and efficient international monitoring system that would have the capability of identifying and measuring effects related to nuclear explosions in three environments through several networks based on different technologies. With the aim of achieving the above-mentioned goals, we endorse close cooperation between the CTBT-implementing organization and the IAEA and its co-location in Vienna. The Slovak Republic supports the early drafting, conclusion and entry into force of a CTBT banning all nuclear explosions once and for all, without any exception. We are pleased that negotiations on the treaty are making progress.

Slovakia welcomes the Agency's efforts to strengthen technical cooperation activities in areas such as nuclear safety, radiation protection, radioactive waste management, food production and the development of groundwater resources. The establishment of the Standing Advisory Group on Technical Assistance and Co-operation (SAGTAC) reflects a common desire to strengthen technical cooperation activities. We consider the concept of model projects to be a key element of the new approach. Model projects are the way to ensure that programmes meet the needs of end-users and conform to the priorities of the recipient country. This new approach is significantly increasing the Agency's contribution to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. In order to achieve social and economic objectives, recipient countries should also use a wider end-user approach to formulate project proposals. The elaboration of a medium-term country plan and a country programme framework will contribute to more effective technical assistance. We believe that the Agency will be provided with sufficient resources to implement its technical cooperation activities. We urge member States to show their deep commitment to the technical cooperation programme by pledging their full share of the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund target.

The Slovak Republic takes a positive view of its cooperation with the IAEA in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It appreciates the contribution of several projects which are organized in collaboration with the IAEA for the further development of Slovakia's nuclear programme and for improvement of the nuclear safety and availability of our nuclear power plants. We welcome the significant increase in the Agency's technical cooperation with Slovakia over the past two years. A model project to strengthen the nuclear safety regulatory body in Slovakia is proceeding very satisfactorily. We are prepared to contribute to regional cooperation and to share our experience through similar projects in other countries.

Cooperation with the IAEA, of which Slovakia is a member of the Board of Governors, plays an important role in international contacts for the Slovak Republic. Technical assistance and cooperation, in particular, have developed very successfully. There are at present 6 national and 11 regional projects under implementation in which Slovakia is taking an active part. It is also successfully developing bilateral and multilateral cooperation with G-24 countries, as well as with other countries.

As to preparatory work for a convention on the safety of radioactive waste management, good progress has been made, and a final draft could be ready within a shorter period than originally anticipated. This is a necessary step to ensure that all countries manage their waste in such a way that the health of the public is assured, and that the nuclear energy option remains sustainable. The convention should be based on internationally accepted standards, international cooperation and exchange of information.

At the beginning of this year, the Slovak Republic ratified the Vienna Convention and the Joint Protocol on liability for nuclear damages. Liability for nuclear damage is a very sensitive issue for all countries, particularly those in Central and Eastern Europe, owing to its close interrelation with technical assistance and supplies from Western companies. We hope that solutions will be found so that the drafting work on the revision of the Vienna Convention can soon be finalized. A broadly supported text is a prerequisite for a successful diplomatic conference and the conclusion of a convention which can attract broad adherence.

It should be underlined that Slovakia — as the first country to have nuclear power reactors on its territory — ratified the Convention on Nuclear Safety at the beginning of this year. We urge other nations to do the same.

In the field of bilateral cooperation, the Slovak Republic has entered into a number of intergovernmental agreements covering the exchange of information and the supply of technology and nuclear materials and equipment for scientific, research and energy generation purposes. The implementation of these agreements complies strictly with the terms of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and with those concluded between the Slovak Republic and the IAEA, as well as those of a number of other international obligations and recommendations.

On the national level, a Nuclear Act is being prepared under the direction of the Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic. This Act will declare the safe uses of nuclear energy, for peaceful purposes only, in conformity with international treaties.

In the Slovak Republic, nuclear energy is being used exclusively for peaceful, predominantly energy-generating, purposes. The country has low national fuel and general energy resources. Nuclear energy plays an inevitable role in the national economy. The Slovak Republic has a long tradition in peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In 1994 it rated fifth in the world, with a nearly 50 per cent share of electricity generated at nuclear power plants. The long-term plan for the energy sector has also recognized that the role of nuclear energy is irreplaceable. It proposes that two WWER-440 type reactor units be put into operation at the Mochovce site by the year 2000, with another two reactor units at the same site to be put into operation later. In addition to the energy sector, nuclear energy is also being applied in health care, scientific research and industry.

We deeply appreciate the cooperation of the IAEA and advanced countries providing technical support, engineering services and nuclear components to Slovakia — especially in nuclear safety matters. All nuclear projects in the Slovak Republic, including the safety upgrading of older reactor units built according to earlier safety standards and the construction of new reactor units, have a significant international character.

Mr. Vajpayee (India): We have heard the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) presented so ably by its Director General Mr. Hans Blix, with keen interest, and noted its contents.

As one of the founder members of the Agency, India has consistently attached the highest importance to the IAEA's objectives. India had the honour and privilege of being the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Agency in 1994-1995. We participate actively in the manifold functions of the Agency — be they promotional, safety-related or regulatory.

The statute of the Agency spells out in unambiguous terms the primary function of the Agency:

> "To encourage and assist research on, and development and practical application of, atomic energy for peaceful uses throughout the world."

While welcoming the measures and decisions taken by the Agency to strengthen its promotional activities, we call on States to pledge their respective shares of the Assistance and Technical Cooperation Fund and to make timely payments to the Fund. We are, however, dismayed to see the great resistance shown by some countries to backing these consensus decisions with adequate financial support. India has been a staunch supporter of the Agency's technical cooperation activities. In the last year or so, the Agency has taken important steps in strengthening these activities through, *inter alia*, the Policy Review Seminar and development of model projects. We also welcome resolutions on the Agency's role in extensive use of isotope hydrology for water resources management and the regional projects associated with desalination for producing potable water economically.

These, along with resolutions such as that adopted in 1993 on food irradiation, are important practical examples of non-power applications of nuclear energy for the benefit of humankind. We believe the Agency can and must do much more in these areas, as well as addressing the issues of the underutilization of existing facilities in some of the developing countries, while assisting in alleviating the financial problems that are hampering progress on other projects.

The non-power applications of atomic energy in the fields of agriculture, medicine and industry have grown significantly. We hope that the Agency will develop more projects that have a direct bearing on improving the quality of life of people in developing countries and that such model projects will provide an impetus to the growth of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. For its part, India will be ready to enhance its interaction with the Agency in these areas and to share its know-how, either through the technical cooperation programmes of the Agency or on a bilateral basis.

One of the Agency's most important activities, in line with its mandate, should be to assist member States in developing nuclear-power technologies and in facilitating the exchange of technical know-how and information in this field. The profile of this activity should be influenced solely by technical considerations. Basically, the Agency should be an advanced technical body dealing with multidisciplinary areas of science and technology, and should play a proactive and catalytic role in the field of atomic energy. It should be a storehouse and a dissemination centre for technical information in these areas. This kind of role of the Agency, *vis-à-vis* operational experience with existing reactors and design information on advanced reactor systems, will help in advancing the cause of nuclear safety. Such a role will benefit not only the developing countries but also the developed countries. We believe it is high time that the Agency cooperated with developing countries in facing the issues involved in actually setting up nuclear-power plants, rather than limiting its activities to comparative studies and developing databases. We also believe that technology-control regimes must not prove to be a barrier to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Considerable time and effort have been devoted to the strengthening of safeguards under comprehensive safeguards agreements. This is in line with another objective of the Agency, which is to

> "ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it (...) is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose" *(Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency, article II)*.

Experience has shown that this has been done very successfully by the Agency. However, the Agency has also been given in its statute a function

> "to apply safeguards, at the request of the parties, to any bilateral or multilateral arrangement, or at the request of a State" *(ibid., article III, para. 5)*.

Over the years this function seems to have overtaken the former objective. Applying safeguards is an important function and needs to be performed well, in the tradition of the Agency.

India recognizes the purpose of the exercise under way on the strengthening of safeguards and improving their efficiency and cost- effectiveness under the programme called "93+2", but advocates keeping a balanced approach. Overreacting to any situation or calling for measures with doubtful technical value, measures leading to results that may be interpreted subjectively, and so on, may do more harm than good.

Safeguards measures should be cost-effective, legally valid, equitable and politically acceptable and must respect the sovereignty of member States. Applying excessive pressure could only lead to a breakdown of the system, as has been recently observed. Distorting the perspective by excessive use of clichés such as transparency and voluntary submission may lead to a situation where the Agency finds it difficult to give a comprehensive clean chit to a member State, even — as has also been observed — after making intrusive demands. Anything that compromises the credibility of the Agency as a neutral, objective body must be meticulously avoided.

Similarly, on the issue of the implementation of the safeguards agreement between the Agency and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, we feel that this is a complex and substantive issue on which there have been many developments, both technical and political. Our viewpoint has been consistent in that we believe that the best way to resolve this difficult issue is through patient discussion among all the parties concerned. We support a policy of cooperation and dialogue rather than one of confrontation and imposition of deadlines, and in this spirit we welcome the movement forward in the discussions between the United States and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). For this reason in the General Conference we abstained on the resolution, which we felt was not contributing to a positive result.

The threat posed by illicit trafficking in nuclear materials is grave, particularly when it is linked to clandestine nuclear programmes. We have noted the efforts of the Agency to help improve national systems of accounting and control, as well as its intention to develop a reliable database of incidents of illicit trafficking. While prevention of illicit trafficking is entirely a national responsibility, the Agency can help by conducting training programmes.

The recent nuclear tests carried out by some States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) soon after its indefinite extension highlight the inherent defects of the Treaty. These developments will also have repercussions on the comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty. We see that treaty as a step towards nuclear disarmament, but it will be meaningful only if it is linked firmly to the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a stipulated time framework. Our position on the NPT is well known. We have always unequivocally supported all efforts at non-proliferation that are universal, comprehensive and non-discriminatory. A sincere attempt to reach this goal is conspicuous now by its absence.

India has always supported the activities of the Agency, which has evolved useful mechanisms for increasing the interaction of member States. In addition to the training programmes, the mechanisms of coordinated research and research contracts programmes are particularly useful. Recently, India also provided some nuclear instrumentation and related software to the IAEA Laboratory at Seibersdorf. These included iodine, air particulate and Argon-41 monitors, which together form an Environmental Activity Release Monitoring System. This will be used by the Seibersdorf Laboratories for the training of scientists and technicians. We are capable of commercially supplying a variety of nuclear instruments to meet the demands of the IAEA member States.

Before concluding, I should once again like to reiterate that we extend our full support for and cooperation with the IAEA in its efforts towards promoting and enhancing the peaceful uses of atomic energy for the benefit of the health, peace and prosperity of people throughout the world.

Mr. Inderfurth (United States of America): On behalf of the United States, my delegation wishes to express its strong support for cosponsorship of the draft resolution before the General Assembly today on the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and its annual report for 1994. As the Assembly knows, the IAEA is entrusted with the dual responsibility of promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and of guarding against its use for any military purpose. Through safeguards, the IAEA performs an important global security function and, as such, is an institution of critical importance to the United States and the international community. We commend Director General Blix and the IAEA secretariat for their continued, effective and committed service.

The IAEA's extensive, effective and unique system of safeguards provides a foundation of international cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The safeguards system builds confidence among States that transfers of nuclear technology and information will not be diverted to military purposes and thereby undermine international peace and security.

My Government supports the actions taken by the IAEA and the Board of Governors for a strengthened and cost-effective safeguards programme. In particular, we support efforts to increase access to information and locations in order to improve the Agency's ability to detect diversion of nuclear material from declared facilities and to provide credible assurance of the absence of undeclared facilities.

With respect to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the United States has always considered it to be the benchmark of the international non-proliferation regime. We believe its indefinite extension this past May confirmed the international community's commitment to preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and to enhancing global security and stability.

On the subject of Iraq, recent revelations from Iraq regarding its programmes to develop weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, confirm the extent to which that country is willing to go to deceive the international community and fail to honour its obligations under relevant Security Council resolutions. The United States commends the continuing efforts of the IAEA to determine the scope of Iraq's clandestine nuclear-weapons programme; undertaken in clear violation of Iraq's commitments as a party to the NPT. We support the IAEA's work in putting in place a long-term monitoring mechanism in Iraq, which is essential to continuing efforts to thwart future Iraqi acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. I use this opportunity to call again upon Iraq to honour fully and honestly the commitments it accepted under Security Council resolution 687 (1971), and others, and to provide immediately all information and equipment relating to its weapons of mass destruction programmes to the IAEA and to the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM).

In pursuit of peace on the troubled Korean Peninsula, my Government worked hard to achieve the October 1994 Agreed Framework with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). Under that agreement, both sides accepted obligations to defuse tensions on the Peninsula and to create a viable nuclear-energy programme in the DPRK. Progress under the Agreed Framework is continuing. However, none of the work currently under way would be possible without the unique role performed by the IAEA in monitoring the freeze of the DPRK's existing nuclear programme as envisaged in the Agreed Framework. There is a long way to go to achieve full implementation of this remarkable agreement. However, each step forward will strengthen the prospect for truly lasting peace in the region. The IAEA should take great satisfaction from its involvement in this important effort.

The IAEA should also take great satisfaction from serving as a catalyst for the successful conclusion of the International Convention on Nuclear Safety, which was opened for signature in September 1994. The safety Convention represents an effort by the international community to ensure that the use of nuclear energy is safe, well regulated and environmentally sound. Its main precept, however, is that the safe use of nuclear as well as other forms of energy remains essentially the national responsibility of the respective States. Through the Convention, States will bind themselves to a number of important safety guidelines and accept to participate in and report to periodic peer-review meetings to verify implementation of the Convention's obligations. The United States was an original signatory of this instrument. We encourage other States to sign on and ratify the Convention.

On the subject of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, we commend the IAEA secretariat for its efforts to improve delivery of technical cooperation with the creation of the model-project concept. We believe the effort to improve project formulation, management and implementation can only lead to a more efficient programme. The United States will remain engaged in this effort. After all, it is the peaceful uses of nuclear energy in the areas of medicine, agriculture and industry which demonstrate its concrete, tangible benefits to mankind.

In closing, my Government wishes to commend the IAEA for its invaluable contribution to international peace, security and welfare. The United States pledges its continuing strong support for the important work of the IAEA.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has listened attentively to the statement by Mr. Hans Blix, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and takes note of the report of the Agency. I wish to express, on behalf of the Chinese delegation, our appreciation for the Agency's efforts last year in promoting international cooperation in peaceful uses of nuclear energy and in nuclear non-proliferation.

Over the past year progress has been made in the field of international cooperation in peaceful uses of nuclear energy and in nuclear non-proliferation. Last May, in this very Hall, the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) decided without a vote to extend the NPT indefinitely and adopted the "Principles and Objectives on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament" and the "Strengthening of the Review Mechanism of the [NPT]". These results of the NPT Review Conference are useful for the enhancement of the international nuclear non-proliferation regime and the maintenance of international peace and security and would help to enhance the role of the IAEA in promoting peaceful uses of nuclear energy and therefore would conform to the interests of all States parties.

Promoting peaceful uses of nuclear energy, as well as international cooperation in this field, is one of the main objectives set forth in the statute of the IAEA. The

Chinese delegation is pleased to note that the Agency has in recent years undertaken some tentative reform measures in the field of technical cooperation and assistance. The model projects proposed and initially implemented by the Agency's secretariat have taken into full account the economic-development priorities and specific requirements of the recipient countries. These projects, therefore, have received the support of the recipient Governments and are showing good prospects for socio-economic benefits. China attaches importance to these projects. In 1994, the Chinese Government pledged a donation of $1 million to the Agency, mainly to finance two model Agency projects in Africa. To help promote these projects, this year the Chinese Government has again pledged to the Agency $200,000.

The prevention of nuclear proliferation has a bearing on the maintenance of international peace and security. It is an important issue of wide concern to the IAEA member States as to how the Agency should proceed from its statute and relevant international agreements and fulfil its safeguards functions in a fairer and more effective manner. China attaches importance to the safeguards of the Agency, appreciates the efforts of the Agency's secretariat in its implementation of Programme "93+2", and has taken note of a whole set of measures proposed by the secretariat to strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of the safeguards regime. China believes that the improved safeguards system should be fair, objective, rational, transparent and feasible, and implemented strictly in accordance with the statute and relevant international agreements, on the basis of respect for the sovereignty of countries concerned, without jeopardizing their legitimate rights.

China holds that the strengthening of the safeguards regime must avoid any adverse effect on the development of nuclear science, technology and industry in various countries, or on international cooperation in peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Any discrimination or abuse of safeguards information and verification must be avoided.

China holds that the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) should not be interpreted as allowing the perpetual possession of nuclear weapons by nuclear-weapon countries. China consistently stands for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and works for the early realization of a nuclear-weapon-free world. As a State party to the NPT and a member of the IAEA, China has fulfilled in good faith its obligations in the field of international cooperation in peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the promotion of nuclear disarmament.

This year marks the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. At a time when we are appraising the efforts of the United Nations in the past 50 years in promoting international peace and development, we expect the IAEA, an important specialized agency of the United Nations, to play an increased role in promoting international cooperation in peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the prevention of nuclear proliferation. China will, as always, work with all other member countries of the IAEA for the achievement of the objectives set out in the statute.

Mr. Kovanda (Czech Republic): My delegation has associated itself with the statement of the European Union presented by the delegation of Spain earlier in the meeting, and I will therefore limit myself to a few additions and points of emphasis. The Czech Republic views the IAEA as one of the most important bodies within the United Nations system, and welcomed its annual General Conference held in Vienna from 18 to 22 September 1995. During its thirty-ninth session, the General Conference concentrated on evaluating the IAEA's activities in the previous period, and we consider the previous year a successful one.

The indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the thorough evaluation of all aspects of implementing it were the most important events of the year. We recall the difficulties we faced on the way to this objective. But member States have now explicitly committed themselves to exclusively peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and very clearly reiterated their "no" to any threat of world destruction by nuclear weapons. These accomplishments fully coincide with the foreign policy objectives of the Czech Republic.

No discussion of peaceful uses of nuclear energy can avoid issues of nuclear safety: that is, the safe operation of nuclear facilities, safe management of nuclear waste, protection against radiation, and liability for nuclear damage. Signing the Convention on Nuclear Safety, during the thirty-eighth session of the IAEA General Conference, was an important step in allaying these concerns. The Czech Republic was among the first 20 signatories of the Convention, and our Parliament ratified it on 23 May 1995. My country encourages all member States which have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Convention, so that it may enter into force as soon as possible. This too is what GC(39)/RES/13 of the General Conference invited them to do.

The issue of the safe manipulation of nuclear waste is one of our main priorities. Preparing the draft of the relevant convention and convening an expert session in Vienna in June 1995 were steps in the right direction. We do not assume that working out the final draft of the new convention will be problem-free. Nevertheless, our common objective — global protection of the population against the irresponsible manipulation of nuclear waste — should help us to find generally acceptable language.

Of course, acceptance of a convention does not automatically assure its objectives. An operational multilateral verification mechanism which will dispel concerns about breaches of its provisions is essential for achieving the objective in question. My delegation respects the IAEA's role in providing safeguards at nuclear facilities all over the world. We continue to support the Agency's effort to develop a strengthened safeguard system based on the so-called Programme "93+2", which integrates all proven items of the present system with certain additional measures. We welcome the adoption of GC(39)/RES/17, which requested the Director General of the IAEA to implement, at an early date, measures outlined in Part 1 of document GOV/2807 and as soon as possible, after consulting member States, to put before the Board of Governors clear proposals for measures suggested in Part 2.

As we appreciate the necessity to ensure sufficient financial means for inspections on the basis of collective responsibility, we welcome the agreement on a new system of financing safeguards as well as on voluntary contributions to the Technical Assistance and Co-operation Fund, approved by the IAEA General Conference. The Czech Republic is committed to paying its pledges in full and on time.

Even though my country acceded only two years ago to the Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage, we welcome attempts to amend the present text of this Convention so that it also covers areas not exhaustively covered currently. We believe that the Standing Committee on Liability for Nuclear Damage should focus on revising the Vienna Convention, and are open to all ideas concerning more universal coverage. We consider the supplementary funding issue a very important component of these discussions.

Illicit trafficking in nuclear material is a most serious matter. We fully support the steps the Agency has taken in order to stop it. In view of our geographical location, we particularly appreciate close regional cooperation in this matter.

The Czech Republic supports the IAEA's effort to monitor the freeze of the nuclear programme in specified facilities in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, according to the mandate the IAEA has from the United Nations Security Council. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea should meet its obligations and fully implement the full scope of safeguards within its territory. We also appeal to its authorities to provide the Agency with all necessary information to help complete the country's initial report on the inventory of its nuclear material subject to safeguards.

In the light of the detection of further details of the Iraqi nuclear-weapon development programme in August 1995, we also fully support the Agency's right to continue to monitor every aspect of Iraq's ability to develop nuclear weaponry. In GC(39)/RES/5, the General Conference appealed to Iraq to cooperate consistently with the Agency, particularly with regard to the ongoing monitoring and verification plan.

I wish to express my delegation's appreciation and support for the work of Director General, Mr. Hans Blix, and of the Agency's secretariat, which performs excellently even under difficult financial circumstances. And in conclusion, my delegation recommends the adoption of the draft resolution concerning the IAEA, of which we are a sponsor exactly as submitted.

Mr. Hudyma (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of Ukraine would like to thank the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for his comprehensive and well-balanced report on the work of the Agency last year. It is clear from the report that the Agency has continued the successful performance of its activities in promoting worldwide cooperation in the peaceful and safe use of nuclear energy.

I also welcome the fact that the IAEA is seen as one of the most effective Agencies of the United Nations. There is no doubt that this organ plays an important role in ensuring the non-use of nuclear energy for military purposes, rendering assistance to Member States, enhancing the safety of nuclear activities within States and disseminating nuclear technology for applications in various fields. I am convinced that the IAEA, as an organ of the United Nations system specializing in the nuclear field, will continue to promote peace and security throughout the world.

This year was marked by a truly historic event in the promotion of nuclear non-proliferation: the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), whose fundamental importance in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons has been proved over the 25 years of its existence. Ukraine acceded to the Treaty as a non-nuclear-weapon State and is doing all it can to do away with the nuclear potential it inherited from the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). I should like to express the conviction that this well-thought-out and deliberate decision by my Government, along with its consistent support of the need to make the Treaty permanent, helped promote the success of the Conference of the Parties to the NPT, which was held in this very Hall.

We also welcome the progress made in other important areas of arms control and disarmament and wish to express the hope that the Conference on Disarmament will complete negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty in 1996 and that it will make significant progress in its work on a convention to ban the production of fissile materials for military purposes. We take a favourable view of the efforts to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, as well as the willingness expressed by the United States, the United Kingdom and France to accede, after Russia and China, to the Protocols of the Treaty of Rarotonga. My Government is convinced that these steps will promote the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions of the world as well.

The IAEA safeguards play an important role in the implementation of the NPT. Thanks to the effective operation of the safeguards system and the consolidation of cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Agency is contributing significantly to strengthening general safety and ensuring general development. In the future the IAEA should resolve matters related to the more complex tasks in the ongoing process of nuclear disarmament, which will remain an immutable reality.

In its desire to promote fully the consolidation of the safeguards system, Ukraine stated its readiness, at the thirty-ninth session of the IAEA, to sign the agreement relevant to its accession to the NPT. I should also like to note that the current agreement between Ukraine and the IAEA on the application of safeguards to all nuclear materials and all peaceful nuclear activities in Ukraine, despite the country's extremely problematic economic situation, is being successfully implemented as of last January. With the Agency's direct and active support and assistance, significant work has been done to implement the provisions of this agreement, including the establishment of a Government system for the accounting and monitoring of nuclear materials, inspections, training of personnel and the preparation of the necessary technical facilities. Ukraine attaches great importance to the linkages in the Agency's fundamental activities between safeguards, safety and technology transfer. Ensuring the safety of nuclear technology, nuclear-waste management and cooperation in the various applications of nuclear technology all depend on the assurance that nuclear energy and technology are being used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

Ukraine was among the first signatories of the Convention on Nuclear Safety. We believe that high standards of protection and of nuclear-waste management are extremely important if the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes is to be continued. At the end of 1995 the Ukraine's Supreme Council passed a law on the use of nuclear energy and radiological protection, which was drafted in accordance with the provisions of the Convention on Nuclear Safety. Work is now under way to align domestic legislation and safety regulations with the requirements of this new law. We hope to complete this process in the very near future so that the Convention on Nuclear Safety can be submitted for ratification as soon as possible.

The delegation of Ukraine welcomes the significant progress made in the establishment of standards for nuclear-waste management and in the drafting of a relevant convention. Ukraine participates in the group of experts established for that purpose and hopes that the active approach of all States will make it possible to reach a long-term consensus solution to the problem of nuclear-waste management. In this connection, we wish to note that Ukraine has adopted a law on regulating nuclear-waste management, which is a very important sphere of activity.

Another important problem for the international system of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is illicit trafficking in nuclear materials. We believe that, even though States themselves are responsible for an adequate and effective level of physical protection against nuclear materials, the IAEA and other international organizations can play an important role in ensuring international cooperation, including by providing technical assistance to countries in fields other than law-enforcement. We consider it important for the IAEA to take the measures needed to improve the Agency's existing database on illicit traffic in nuclear materials, and we believe this database should include information on other sources of radioactivity. We call upon all States to take national measures that would promote the operation of such a system.

In conclusion, I would like to touch upon yet another problem of exceptional importance to my country: the question of the future of the Chernobyl plant and of energy in Ukraine as a whole. Nuclear energy continues to play a significant role in our country's economy. Nuclear power plants produce over a third of all the electrical power generated in Ukraine, and the proportion of atomic energy in our country's energy supply continues to rise. As for shutting down Chernobyl, we are pleased to note that this question is receiving the international community's attention. We welcome the Agency's initiative to convene in the spring of 1996 an international conference in connection with the tenth anniversary of the accident in Chernobyl's block IV. At the same time, the negotiating process on the proposals adopted by the Big Seven in Naples in 1994 regarding ways and means to shut down Chernobyl has not yet been completed. The President of Ukraine has stated his plans to shut down Chernobyl before the year 2000, on condition that large-scale assistance rendered to Ukraine in the fields of energy and nuclear safety as a whole be fully in line with the realities existing in Ukraine today.

At the end of the summer, in his letter to the Heads of State of the Big Seven, the President of Ukraine confirmed Ukraine's position on this issue. However, he pointed out again that the West's delay in providing the promised assistance would force Ukraine to act on the basis — first and foremost of national priorities as well as our country's economic and technical capacities.

For Ukraine, which is carrying out economic reforms under complex financial-economic conditions, assistance from other States in resolving the problems of Chernobyl will have a decisive impact.

In addition, we cannot speak of shutting down the Chernobyl plant without an understanding of problems connected with ensuring safety in the plant and in the Ukritiye facility and rehabilitating the contaminated area as a whole. I should like to point out that to date all the work related to the safe operation of the Chernobyl plant and the rehabilitation of the contaminated Ukritiye territory is being carried out by Ukraine independently, without any support from the international community and that Ukraine is spending annually over $100 million to this end.

Ukraine considers that one of the possible ways to obtain an objective analysis of and to solve the problems connected with the Chernobyl accident would be to set up an international technological research centre which would deal with issues related to the elimination of the consequences of nuclear radiological accidents and in whose work leading experts from various countries in the world could participate. We call upon all countries to cooperate in the establishment of such a centre.

In conclusion, I should like to assure the General Assembly that Ukraine will continue to play a constructive role in resolving the important tasks connected with the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

Mr. Raichev (Bulgaria): At the outset I should like to express my delegation's strong support for the views contained in the statement of the representative of Spain made on behalf of the European Union and the States associated with it. Bulgaria, as one of those States, shares the attitudes set forth in the statement.

My delegation commends the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), under the able leadership of Mr. Hans Blix, for its continuing success in adapting to a series of new and demanding challenges over the past year. The report that the Director General introduced on the activities of the Agency in 1994 demonstrates that its tasks have been undertaken in a way that inspires confidence and appreciation from the member States. For this reason, my delegation is a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/50/L.11, on the Agency's annual report.

The thirty-ninth session of the General Conference of the IAEA met in a year that was a landmark for nuclear non-proliferation. On 11 May the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons took the historic decision to extend the Treaty indefinitely, to strengthen the review process and to adopt a set of principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. We welcome this outcome, which is in the best security interests of all.

The Review and Extension Conference recognized the outstanding role of the IAEA in implementing the basic provisions of the Treaty. The outcome of the

Conference has far-reaching implications for the work of the Agency, particularly as regards the safeguards system, which underpins a major part of the non-proliferation regime and international cooperation in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The IAEA was expressly recognized as the competent authority responsible for verifying and assuring compliance with safeguards agreements. We support the Agency's ongoing activities aimed at strengthening the effectiveness and improving the efficiency of the safeguards regime. The development of measures to enhance the IAEA system of safeguards is progressing well, and excellent results were achieved at the June meeting of the Board of Governors. We look forward to considering further detailed Agency proposals on part II measures of the Programme "93+2" later this year. There is no doubt that the IAEA full-scope safeguard agreements are of universal benefit and will remain the key element in encouraging international cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The resolution adopted at last year's General Conference on the strengthening of the Agency's technical cooperation activities has resulted in a number of initiatives which need to be commended. Compared with past years, the level of implementation of the Technical Cooperation Programme has been the highest. Of special interest also are the proposals for a country programme framework and the model-project approach, which broaden the principal objective of technical cooperation toward the achievement of social and economic goals. In our view, these activities should be further developed and expanded.

In 1994 Bulgaria continued to fulfil its obligations under the safeguards agreement with the IAEA. During the year, there has been no change in the number and operational status of our nuclear facilities, which total six operating nuclear power reactors, one repository for spent nuclear fuel, and one research reactor. The Agency carried out eight inspections on two technical visits to check up on the inventory and the accountancy for our nuclear material. The official statements of the IAEA on the findings of the inspections have shown that my country is strictly observing its commitment under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

Nuclear power and nuclear methods and techniques are widely used in various sectors of our national economy. Nuclear power plays a significant role in meeting the power needs of the country. For example, in 1994 only 45.6 per cent of power production was of nuclear origin. Very serious attention is being paid to ensure safety at the Kozloduy nuclear power plant. Long-term measures are taken to ensure safety conditions; these could be best described as "sustainable safety". In all our efforts during the past several years aimed at enhancing nuclear safety, we have been supported by the IAEA. In cooperation with the Agency, national projects have been implemented, such as those of the improvement of national regulatory standards on nuclear and radiational safety, for the modernization of the equipment for tritium measurement in the radiochemical laboratory of Sofia University; and for the assessment of the safety at the sites of the Kozloduy nuclear power plant and the Belene nuclear power plant, in particular their seismic characteristics and the seismic rigidity of the buildings and facilities.

Bulgaria participated in the regional projects for Eastern Europe related to safety of the water-cooled and moderated type reactor (WWER) safety, spent fuel repositories, radioactive waste management and strengthening of regulatory bodies. Bulgaria participates in the international system of nuclear information and the system for incident reporting.

In conclusion, I should like to reaffirm our intention to cooperate fully with the Agency's member States and its secretariat with a view to attaining the goals we have set together for the future performance of the IAEA.

Mr. Al-Awoi (Kuwait) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: We discuss today one of the most important items on the General Assembly's agenda. The item's importance is much greater at this session in view of the nature of the new developments that have taken place with regard to the work and competence of the IAEA.

My delegation is fully aware of the important task undertaken by the Agency in the areas of nuclear power, nuclear technologies, nuclear safety, radiation protection and the management of radioactive wastes. We are aware also of the assistance extended by the International Atomic Energy Agency to developing countries in all these areas. As we commemorate at this session of the General Assembly the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, with special emphasis on the Organization's major objective of maintaining international peace and security, we must acknowledge that the Agency now performs one of the most important roles in striving after that objective. We must emphasize also that the proliferation of nuclear weapons poses a real threat to security and stability at the international and regional levels.

The vital role of the International Atomic Energy Agency has acquired added importance through the world community's realization of the clear connection between disarmament and development. Huge military expenditures impede economic development and adversely affect the content and scope of international economic cooperation. Accordingly, the Agency's role in making sure that nuclear energy is used for peaceful purposes, is vital for the promotion of international peace and security and, thereby, works in favour of one of the major objectives of our Organization.

The international community has witnessed two important developments in the two areas of proliferation or control of weapons of mass destruction. The most important development I can refer to today is the success achieved last April with the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). My country believes that this Treaty is the cornerstone of the international regime that prevents the proliferation of one of the most deadly of overkill weapons that cause concern for all countries of the world. We, therefore, call upon Israel once again to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in response to the fundamental requirement of peace in the region.

It is only right that I should refer to the second of those two developments in the area of controlling the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, in the wake of the grave and tremendous information that has been unearthed recently concerning Iraq's armaments programme. Had it not been for the grace of God, the efforts of the Special Commission that has been entrusted with the task of destroying Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and the efforts of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Iraq would have been able to destabilize the whole of the Middle East region and of the world at large. The recent unearthing of the grave details of the armaments programmes that Iraq had kept secret is a serious development indeed, not in terms of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons alone, but also as a breach and a violation of the safety measures that the International Atomic Energy Agency stresses very strongly indeed.

My delegation wishes to extend its thanks and appreciation to the Director General of the IAEA and to his staff, and to the Chairman of the Special Commission for the untiring efforts deployed in following up Iraq's implementation of Security Council resolutions 687 (991), 707 (1991) and 715 (1991). However, my country is keen that the pressure be maintained to force Iraq to implement these resolutions in a manner that would put paid to the threats Iraq poses to the countries of the region, especially in view of that country's known preparation, following its invasion of Kuwait, of a crash programme that aimed at producing nuclear weapons in a short period of time, from the high-grade uranium it extracted from the nuclear fuels of its two reactors. This was scheduled to reach completion by April 1991. However, the Allies' aerial bombardment during the liberation of my country put a stop to that operation, thanks be to Allah.

This, without a doubt, exposes Iraq's lies in its official statements to the Security Council wherein it had insisted that it had halted all research and development operations relating to the production of nuclear weapons with the beginning of its invasion of my country. Mr. Hans Blix has assured the members of the Security Council recently that Iraq's attempt to use enriched uranium in September 1991 constituted a clear breach of the agreement signed by Iraq and the International Atomic Energy Agency. He has also stressed the fact that Iraq's concealment of the latest information over the past four years was in flagrant violation of its commitments under the relevant Security Council resolutions.

The fears and anxieties caused by Iraq's armaments programme do not arise from its possession of nuclear weapons alone. Those fears and anxieties extend to other weapons of mass destruction, especially chemical and biological weapons. Iraq has made great strides in that direction too. What causes special concern to Kuwait, however, is that Iraq has not yet acceded to the NPT while all its actions and intentions show that it constitutes a threat to peace and security in the region.

Kuwait is absolutely convinced that it is imperative to consolidate all efforts in trying to develop the human race and to safeguard its right to live in peace and security without the fears and anxieties caused by weapons for its extermination and without any threat to its stability or to its aspirations after a better world.

The human race deserves to be prepared for a world wherein advanced technology would be used to ensure the prosperity and development of humanity and not for the purpose of its destruction and effacement from the face of the earth. This can be achieved only through the deep conviction that international relations should be governed by the principles of peace, democracy, freedom, the equal sovereignty of States and the promotion of peaceful cooperation.

Mr. Al-Akwa (Yemen) (*interpretation from Arabic*): As representatives must be hungry by now, I promise that my statement will not be long.

I should like, at the outset, to express our deep thanks and appreciation to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for its assistance to the developing countries, including our country, the Republic of Yemen, to which the Agency has granted several fellowships and technical grants in the fields of health, agriculture and pharmacology. We commend also the IAEA Director General, Mr. Hans Blix, and his colleagues for their efforts in the preparation of the report on the Agency's activities in 1994.

There is no doubt that the activities undertaken and the responsibilities shouldered by the Agency are worthy of our appreciation and respect in view of their positive returns with regard to the safety and security of the whole world, on the one hand, and, on the other, their contribution to social and economic development and other activities by facilitating the transfer of nuclear technologies for peaceful use in the developing countries.

In the field of world peace and security, the Agency must be able to give sufficient guarantees, and it undertakes the full supervision of nuclear installations in various countries to ensure that nuclear energy is not used in a manner that would endanger international peace and security. In this connection, we call upon the countries concerned to enhance their cooperation with the Agency and to support in order for the International Atomic Energy Agency to be able to discharge the statutory functions mandated to it by its statute and enshrined in Treaties on the prevention of nuclear threats and damage.

In this context, we hope that the nuclear States will meet their commitments to the non-nuclear States in accordance with Article VI of the NPT following the Review and Extension Conference of April 1995.

We invoke international legality in calling on the international community to encourage the establishment of zones of peace wherever they may be needed throughout the world, and particularly in the Middle East region, which continues to be threatened by the proliferation of nuclear weapons because a certain country refuses to accede to the NPT and to place its facilities under the IAEA inspection and safeguards system.

Peace, in our conviction and the conviction of others, is an indivisible whole. The international community must therefore take the necessary measures to ensure the universality and comprehensive nature of the NPT, without exception for any State of the region. Perhaps the most important measure in this regard is to begin to work for the implementation of the relevant Security Council resolutions.

Returning to questions relating to the IAEA, we support the call for expanding the membership of the Agency's Board of Governors in order to reflect current economic and political developments and the democratic nature of the post-cold-war world. To this end, we should reconsider Article VI of the Agency's statute. In this regard, we support the initiative of the Kingdom of Morocco as contained in document GOV/2814/Rev.1.

Mr. Park (Republic of Korea): My delegation wishes to express its deep appreciation to Director General Hans Blix of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for his excellent and informative report. We also commend Mr. Blix and, through him, the secretariat of the Agency for the devotion and professionalism with which they have carried out their responsibilities.

Safeguards and technical cooperation are the twin pillars of the IAEA's responsibilities. In both areas, the Agency is faced with daunting challenges. Now that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is indefinitely extended, the Agency's mandate to verify States Parties' undertakings under the Treaty has been put on a permanent footing. The challenge for the Agency in this connection is to keep providing credible assurances on States Parties' compliance with their non-proliferation commitments in an increasingly volatile international security environment and amidst a rapid quantitative increase in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and constant advances in nuclear technology.

The Agency's safeguards system, which is primarily aimed at verifying the non-diversion of nuclear material from declared facilities, has revealed serious shortcomings in recent cases of non-compliance. Providing assurances with respect to the absence of undeclared activities of NPT States Parties has now become indispensable if the Agency is to fulfil its mandate under the Treaty. In this regard, my Government attaches great importance to the Agency's measures to strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of the safeguards system under Programme "93+2". We welcome the IAEA Board of Governors' endorsement of

Part I of the Programme last June and look forward to the early adoption of Part II.

We attach particular importance to those measures designed to strengthen the Agency's capability to detect undeclared nuclear activities, including environmental monitoring and no-notice inspection. A more effective safeguards system is a necessary condition for verifying States parties' non-proliferation commitments, but it is not a sufficient condition to deter a determined State from developing nuclear weapons. Programme "93+2" can attain its intended purpose only when the States parties are willing to cooperate with the IAEA inspectorate in the implementation of the Programme.

The strengthened safeguards system is not only important from the perspective of nuclear non-proliferation. It is all the more important for the contribution it can make to the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy by fostering an international climate of mutual confidence through greater worldwide nuclear transparency. The IAEA's technical cooperation programmes are designed precisely to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In fact, one of the tangible benefits developing countries expect from accession to the NPT is technical cooperation from the IAEA. Therefore, what many developing countries have expected of donor countries in the wake of the indefinite extension of the NPT is a gesture of political goodwill in funding the Agency's technical cooperation programmes. In this connection, my delegation wishes to express its concern at the declining interest of donor countries in technical cooperation financing. If the IAEA is going to fulfil its statutory responsibilities in the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, we believe that it is essential to put the financing of the Agency's technical cooperation activities on a secure and predictable footing.

For many developing countries, nuclear power is one of the most viable options for meeting the growing energy requirements of environmentally sustainable development. The Republic of Korea has 10 power reactors in operation and six units under construction, which supply roughly one-third of its electricity needs. As such, nuclear power has proved to be the most economical and clean source of energy, permitting sustained economic growth in my country. The Republic of Korea is willing to share with other countries the technical capabilities and experiences in the application of nuclear energy that it has accumulated over the years.

Central to the promotion of nuclear energy is nuclear safety. In this respect, we call upon those countries which have not done so to ratify the Convention on Nuclear Safety without further delay. We welcome the adoption of Safety Fundamentals by the IAEA Board of Governors and look forward to the finalization of the convention on the safe management of radioactive waste at the earliest date.

My Government shares the view that the time has come to reform the IAEA Board of Governors through the amendment of Article VI of the Agency's statute. In our view, the current composition of the Board does not properly reflect the fundamental and structural changes that the international nuclear community has undergone since the last reform of the Board more than 20 years ago.

We strongly believe that the Board should be restructured in such a way as to accommodate the dynamic features of underlying international realities. A timely reform is indispensable not only for the organizational vitality of the Agency, but also for maintaining the representativeness of the Board and the relevance of its decisions. We also call for transparency in the practice of designating Board members. The designation process should be guided by objective criteria and conducted in compliance with the relevant provisions of the IAEA statute.

Turning now to the North Korean nuclear issue, we note that the long- standing international efforts to resolve the issue have entered a new phase with the signing of the US-DPRK Agreed Framework on 21 October 1994 in Geneva. We welcomed the Agreed Framework as a positive step toward the ultimate resolution of the North Korean nuclear issue.

There has been some progress in the implementation of the Agreed Framework, including uninterrupted monitoring by the IAEA inspectors of the freeze of specified nuclear facilities in North Korea, as requested by the Security Council. Discussions are currently under way between the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization and North Korea on the provision of light water reactors in the context of implementation of the Agreed Framework.

It must be recalled, however, that a bilateral agreement cannot replace, supersede or detract from multilateral obligations under the IAEA-DPRK safeguards agreement, which remains binding and in force. The

Agreed Framework is a complementary instrument to bring North Korea into full compliance with its multilateral legal obligations under the NPT and the safeguards agreement. Despite modest progress from the standpoint of the Agreed Framework, there is no change in the situation of North Korea's non-compliance with its safeguards agreement with the IAEA. While expressing our concern over North Korea's continuing non-compliance, we urge North Korea to come promptly into full compliance and to take all steps the IAEA deems necessary to preserve, intact, all relevant information on safeguards until North Korea comes into full compliance.

DPRK's early full compliance would certainly serve not only its own best interest, but also the integrity and objectives of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime under the NPT. We also renew our call for North Korea to abide by its undertakings under the Joint Declaration for the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula signed in 1991 by the two parties.

The world is undergoing tremendous changes as the twenty-first century approaches. In the months and years ahead, we all have to put our wisdom and capabilities together to open up nuclear energy for wider applications for economic development and higher standards of living. The Republic of Korea pledges to play its due role in this important field.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

United Nations A/50/PV.47

General Assembly

Fiftieth Session

Official Records

47th plenary meeting
Wednesday, 1 November 1995, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Freitas do Amaral .... (Portugal)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Peerthum (Mauritius), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Agenda item 14 ***(continued)***

Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency

Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Agency (A/50/360)

Draft resolution (A/50/L.11)

Amendment (A/50/L.12)

Mr. Kharrazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran notes with satisfaction the annual report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to the General Assembly for the year 1994, which summarizes the significant achievements of the Agency during that year. We thank Mr. Blix, the Director General of the IAEA, for his thorough and informative statement, which also featured the main developments in the Agency's activities during 1995. Director-General Blix and the IAEA secretariat are to be commended for the commitment and dedication with which they carry out their responsibilities.

As international society draws closer, through a web of regional and international treaties, the roles of international organizations such as the IAEA that implement those treaties become more relevant. Thus, efforts aimed at strengthening the IAEA's authority and functions in accordance with its statute should be supported and further encouraged. In this context we welcome the relevant decisions of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) concerning the activities of the IAEA, which are reflected, *inter alia*, in draft resolution A/50/L.11, "Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency". In this respect the 1995 NPT Review Conference recognized that the IAEA is the competent authority for verifying and assuring that the Treaty obligations of States Parties to the NPT are being fulfilled and that nothing should be done to undermine the Agency's authority in that regard. We also welcome, in principle, the proposals that have been put forward in the Conference on Disarmament to entrust the IAEA with the task of verifying the future comprehensive test-ban treaty.

We have given serious consideration to the Agency's report for the year 1994. It is very unfortunate that the Agency continues to operate under financial constraints, which in turn have had adverse effects on some of its important programmes. We urge member States to take their financial obligations more seriously and to make their payments in a timely manner. At the same time, in view of the present budgetary constraints, we believe that the key objective should be cost-effectiveness.

Another issue in the Agency's activities during this period has been the development of a strengthened safeguards regime. We welcome the measures and

---

95-86489 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

decisions taken by the Agency to maintain and strengthen the effectiveness and cost-efficiency of the safeguards system. Iran, as an original signatory of the NPT, has always adhered to the Agency's safeguards system and will continue to support its effectiveness. Our Government has pursued an open and transparent policy in this respect and, based on that policy, took the initiative to invite the Agency on two occasions to visit the nuclear facilities in Iran and verify their peaceful utilization. Subsequently, the IAEA missions visited Iran in February 1992 and November 1993, and verifications were established to the satisfaction of the Agency. These two visits were in addition to routine inspections that are conducted regularly by the IAEA.

We commend the Agency's efforts to enhance nuclear safety and radiation protection, particularly in the countries of the former USSR. We firmly believe that the scope of such measures should be expanded to all regions that operate nuclear installations, for the risks to life, health, environment and security emanating from such installations are not confined to national boundaries. In this regard, a matter of great concern to Middle East countries is the continued operation of the un-safeguarded, antiquated and entirely non-peaceful Demona nuclear reactor in Israel. We call upon the international community, and the IAEA in particular, to address this problem urgently and effectively.

It should be recalled that only South Africa's accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards system made the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone a reality. A parallel exists in the case of the Middle East. So long as Israel, with the full support of certain Powers, refuses to join the NPT and the IAEA safeguards system, a Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone will remain a distant goal. In this respect, the decision of the General Conference of the IAEA at its thirty-eighth session to restore technical assistance to Israel is nothing but a reward to a nuclear proliferator and tacit approval of that regime's access to nuclear weapons. Iran, the country that in 1974 initiated the proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, continues to support this initiative and is prepared to consider any constructive idea for its realization under the auspices of the United Nations.

The Islamic Republic of Iran attaches great importance to international cooperation in the peaceful application of nuclear energy and has pursued with great interest the promotional role of the Agency in this field. My delegation appreciates the useful technical cooperation the Agency extends to member States in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy in the fields of agriculture, industry and medicine and other related areas such as water desalination. In this regard, one cannot but stress the importance of sustained funding, particularly through voluntary contributions for the Agency's technical assistance programmes.

However, exceptional cases of the violation of the IAEA safeguards in the recent past have provided an excuse for certain nuclear-weapon States and some other industrialized countries to undermine the statutory tasks and obligations of the Agency and infringe more than before the inalienable rights of the parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, as stipulated in that Treaty, including the Islamic Republic of Iran, whose modest, peaceful nuclear activities have always been approved by the Agency.

In conclusion, allow me once again to express our appreciation and support to the IAEA for its efforts in the promotion of international cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects.

Mr. Tsepkala (Belarus): The delegation of the Republic of Belarus has carefully studied the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the period under review and notes with satisfaction that it was prepared with a high degree of professionalism. We are grateful to the Director General of the Agency for his presentation of the report to the General Assembly.

As is mentioned in the report, the Agency's contribution to international security through its verification activities and to the transfer of nuclear technology — in other words, to the fulfilment of the Agency's functions related to nuclear non-proliferation — continued to be major focal points of its work in 1994. The Republic of Belarus, as a country which strictly adheres to the principles of non-proliferation and makes a considerable contribution to the strengthening of the non-proliferation regime, attaches particular importance to this activity of the Agency.

Having attained its independence, Belarus took the decision to become a non-nuclear State. That decision was reflected in the Constitution of the Republic. Ratification of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) and simultaneous accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), as a non-nuclear State, constituted further steps in this direction.

As representatives of the Republic of Belarus have already mentioned in their statements at this session, Belarus signed the safeguards agreement with the IAEA on 14 April 1995 and it entered into force on 31 July 1995.

The report points out that:

> "The credibility of commitments made by States not to acquire nuclear weapons has become increasingly important, particularly as States which do possess nuclear weapons move to reduce their arsenals". *(IAEA Annual Report for 1994, GC(39)/3, p. 1)*

In this connection, I would like to emphasize that all the actions of our State are fully in conformity with its commitments. In late April 1992 — in other words, ahead of time — Belarus withdrew tactical nuclear weapons from its territory and worked out a schedule of withdrawal of strategic nuclear weapons, a schedule which it is consistently carrying out. We also intend to strictly follow our obligations under the safeguards agreement with the IAEA.

It should be noted that it is not at all easy for a newly independent State undergoing a severe economic crisis to keep to these commitments. In these circumstances, we greatly appreciate the assistance rendered by international organizations, and by some countries. The Belarusian delegation stresses the positive role of the IAEA as coordinator in the strengthening of the infrastructure of radiation and nuclear safety in newly independent States. Preparations by the Agency for the implementation of safeguards, for the identification of safeguards requirements, and for the exposition of the need for support by donor States, coordinated by the Agency, were extremely useful for Belarus. Without any doubt, training in nuclear material accountancy and training provided to facilities personnel and organized by the Agency are also important.

We believe that the IAEA should continue to play a special role in strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime. The decisions of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), held in May 1995, all but confirm this conclusion.

Illicit trafficking in nuclear material may constitute a serious threat to the security of States. Belarus is striving to strictly fulfil its obligations under the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material. At present, a project envisaging the creation of a reliable system of physical protection of nuclear material is being worked out in Belarus. We would be very grateful for assistance in the implementation of this project.

In 1996, we shall mark the tenth anniversary of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, which was the biggest radiation catastrophe in the history of mankind. In this Hall, we have spoken more than once about this dreadful catastrophe, which turned out to be a calamity for the Belarusian people, and about the immeasurable damage to the economy of the country.

Our delegation is grateful to the IAEA for its continued support of the United Nations International Cooperation on Chernobyl. As is stated in the report,

> "a major effort was undertaken to collect precise information on the increased incidence of thyroid cancers among children in Belarus, Ukraine and the Russian Federation." *(GC(39)/3, p. 147)*

Unfortunately, the report does not contain any information on the results of this effort. Apparently, such information had not been processed when the report was issued.

A number of international conferences aimed at consideration of problems caused by the catastrophe will be held next year. One such conference will take place in March 1996 in Minsk, the capital of Belarus. It will be the first joint conference of the European Union, Belarus, Russia and Ukraine on the aftermath of the Chernobyl accident. We are interested in the broad participation of the representatives of United Nations Member States, the IAEA and other international organizations in this conference and will be ready to welcome all those who would like to take part in it. Belarus will participate actively in the international conferences on Chernobyl issues to be held in Geneva and Vienna.

The organization of technical cooperation is one of the main focuses of the IAEA activities. We support the recommendations of the Third Technical Cooperation Policy Review Seminar, in particular on the elaboration of country programmes for the recipients of technical assistance. Last June Belarus was visited by an IAEA technical-cooperation mission that, together with the representatives of national institutions, worked out proposals on a country programme for Belarus. We hope that the Agency will adopt and implement this programme.

We note with satisfaction that technical assistance to Belarus from the IAEA substantially increased in years past. However, we consider that the Agency, which is called on to promote development and peaceful uses of atomic energy, should provide more considerable assistance to a State that does not have any nuclear-energy facilities in its territory and whose people were the victims of a catastrophic accident at a nuclear power plant belonging to another State. We give priority to the cooperation projects aimed at minimizing the consequences of the Chernobyl accident and strengthening national infrastructure for radiation and nuclear safety.

In conclusion, the Belarusian delegation would like to emphasize that our evaluation of the Agency's work in 1994 is positive. We agree with the priorities the Agency has set for the future and hope for close cooperation with the Agency in resolving all problems related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Mr. Maneka (Pakistan): At the outset, I would like to express, on behalf of the Pakistan delegation, our profound appreciation to Dr. Hans Blix, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), for his statement on the Agency's performance during 1994. The widening scope of the programmes and activities of the IAEA bear witness to the dedication of Dr. Blix and his colleagues at the Agency.

Pakistan has always reposed great confidence in the IAEA as an instrument both to promote nuclear cooperation and to regulate the use of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

We welcome the Agency's annual report for 1994. This comprehensive document deals with a number of complex and technical issues in a manner that will facilitate meaningful discussions on the Agency's major areas of activity.

One central activity, or objective, of the IAEA is the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Despite the negative public perceptions created in some countries and the fears aroused about the danger of nuclear proliferation, nuclear energy remains a viable and attractive energy option for many countries, particularly fossil-fuel-deficient developing countries. The conventional means of generating electricity — thermal, oil, gas and coal-fired plants — not only impose a heavy financial burden on such countries but also constitute serious threats to the environment. Nuclear power, on the other hand, offers a resource-conserving, environmentally benign and financially feasible source of energy.

In view of its multiple benefits, Pakistan deeply appreciates the Director General's continued interest in and support for nuclear power and welcomes his reference to a strengthened programme on the comparative assessment of energy sources for electricity generation. In this regard, the assistance the Agency has rendered to several countries in providing advanced methodologies, such as Model for Analysis of Energy Demand (MAED) and Wien Automatic System Planning Package (WASP), for an integrated approach towards energy and nuclear-power planning is commendable. These methodologies should continue to be made available and should not be constrained by extraneous considerations.

Another area of vital concern to the majority of the members of the Agency is technical cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. It is indeed a source of great satisfaction that in 1994 the ratio of target achievement in the Agency's Technical Cooperation Programme was the highest ever in the history of the IAEA. Of the 12 model projects approved for 1994, 11 have been launched successfully. We wish to express our sincere appreciation to the Department of Technical Cooperation for its dedicated work and innovative approaches, which brought about this unprecedented success. It is hoped that the establishment of the standing advisory group on technical assistance and cooperation will help in further strengthening the planning and implementation of cooperation programmes. While there was widespread support for the model-project approach and new directions in the Technical Cooperation Programme, contributions to the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Fund (TACF) dropped to 72.5 per cent, as compared with 76.5 per cent in 1993. The target for voluntary contributions to the TACF in 1994 was set at $58.5 million, of which $42.4 million was pledged by Member States.

Although contributions to the TACF are voluntary, they support an activity that is the primary statutory responsibility of the Agency. Pakistan has always paid its contribution in full and on time. We are also providing free training to the developing countries, through the Agency's Technical Cooperation Programme, in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We urge all member States to pay their contributions to the TACF in full and on time in order to facilitate the implementation of the Agency's Programme.

Pakistan has consistently adhered to and will continue to lend its fullest support to the Agency's safeguards. This is in conformity with our commitment to nuclear non-proliferation and to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. While we fully agree that the possibility of non-compliance should be minimized or completely eliminated, it is our view that any changes in the present system should remain within the existing legal instruments. Also, the proposed measures to strengthen the safeguards should be technologically feasible, cost-effective and non-intrusive. In this context, we appreciate the work done by the Standing Advisory Group on Safeguards Implementation (SAGSI) and the secretariat on Programme "93+2", but we believe that this important issue should be thoroughly examined and extensively discussed with member States to achieve consensus on its legal, technical and economic aspects.

Pakistan has always supported activities related to the enhancement of nuclear safety. We have actively participated in various technical committee meetings held for the preparation and finalization of the new International Basic Safety Standards. Pakistan was also active in the drafting and adoption of the Convention on Nuclear Safety, and signed the Convention as an original signatory. The success of the Nuclear Safety Convention will depend in large measure on the implementation of provisions relating to cooperation between the industrially advanced countries and the developing countries. It is through continued and unimpeded supply of safety-related information and equipment that the safety of nuclear facilities can be assured and enhanced. Such measures for nuclear safety would be reinforced by an international agreement prohibiting attacks against all nuclear facilities. Pakistan has endeavoured to promote such an agreement. The Agency can play an important role in its realization.

We are greatly encouraged by the passage of the IAEA General Conference resolutions relating to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Pakistan has also made a sincere endeavour to keep South Asia free of nuclear weapons. In this regard, a number of proposals have been made and we continue to hope that these proposals will evoke a positive response.

The regulatory responsibility of the Agency should not lead to the imposition of arbitrary restrictions on the transfer of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Unfortunately, restrictions have been imposed even when it is evident that no proliferation dangers are involved. At times even safety-related information has been refused. This approach is not conducive to the evolution of safer techniques and methods or to the promotion of greater openness and transparency in the field of nuclear technology. Since these are key objectives of the Agency we hope that it will redouble its efforts for their achievement. The IAEA should strive to remove all impediments to the transfer of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

Finally, I would like to address an important organizational matter. A review of Article VI of the statute relating to the expansion of the Board has been under consideration for a long time. We believe that an increased representation of the member States in the Board will improve transparency and effectiveness. We hope that the open-ended consultative group will be able to submit concrete proposals on this issue.

Mr. Butler (Australia): I should like to begin this statement by thanking the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Mr. Hans Blix, for his comprehensive statement given to the Assembly. That statement underlined with great clarity the vital role of the IAEA in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and in promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. We would also like to thank Mr. Blix for his continuing outstanding stewardship of the Organization.

Australia's record of support for the IAEA is long and, we would like to think, second to none. That is why we have always attached importance to the Assembly's consideration of the Agency's annual report to the United Nations and to the General Assembly's resolution with respect to that report. We place great value on the IAEA's international safeguards and technical cooperation activities. These activities in both fields underpin the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The importance accorded to them by the international community was reaffirmed in the decision to extend the NPT indefinitely at the historic 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the States Parties to the NPT in April/May of this year and in the accompanying documents on that occasion entitled "Principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament" and "Strengthening the review process for the Treaty".

The draft resolution before us today highlights the important work being carried out by the Agency in a number of fields — safeguards, technical assistance, nuclear safety, radiological protection and radioactive waste management, to name just a few of them. In all the fields of its work, the IAEA makes a manifest contribution to international security and non-proliferation, and to social and economic development. The Agency's activities in these fields deserve our continuing and strong support. The draft resolution also highlights the important measures and decisions the Agency has taken to strengthen the safeguards system. This was an important element of the decision on principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament adopted at the NPT Review and Extension Conference. Australia has been actively involved in, and strongly supports, the Agency's Programme "93+2" and we hope that the second phase of that programme, including those parts relating to short-notice inspections and environmental monitoring, will soon be taken forward further.

We very much regret that it has been necessary again this year for the draft resolution to record the continuing non-compliance of two States with their safeguards agreements under the NPT. We urge those States — Iraq and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea — to cooperate fully with the Agency in returning to full compliance. These cases of non-compliance underline again the importance of strengthening the safeguards system, particularly in relation to the Agency's capability to detect undeclared nuclear activities.

Technical cooperation is also a central element of the Agency's activities. It is an important means of enabling developing countries to have access to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy under appropriate safeguards, in keeping with article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and as set out in the Agency's statute. This too was recognized in the decision of the NPT Review and Extension Conference on Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament. Australia has long been a supporter of the Agency's technical cooperation activities, and we welcome the measures being introduced to improve and strengthen their effectiveness.

On this occasion there is special significance in our receiving the Agency's annual report. Last week, in this Hall, we celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations. For almost 40 years the International Atomic Energy Agency has also been a central part of international life and cooperation. As we look back on those 40 or 50 years, it is surely a source of agreement amongst us all that two of the burning problems we have faced — the crucial issues on which we have worked together through the years since the end of the Second World War and since the end of colonization — are those of development and the atom. These are amongst the crucial challenges of our time, and they will remain so. It is in this context that one of the closest, most devoted and most effective partners of us all is the International Atomic Energy Agency, with its mandate to ensure that we work together on development and on the atom in a world that is productive and safe.

On this occasion Australia is therefore very pleased to be one of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/50/L.11. We note that, traditionally — at least until recent years — parallel draft resolutions have attracted the consensus support of the General Assembly as ones that take note of and endorse the activities of a truly important international Agency. We hope that on this special occasion — after 50 years of the United Nations and 40 years of the Agency — the draft resolution before the Assembly will also attract consensus support.

Mr. Mazilu (Romania): We are pleased to start our statement by expressing my country's recognition of the work carried out by the International Atomic Energy Agency during 1994 and 1995. We sincerely appreciate the efforts of the Agency's Director General, Mr. Hans Blix, and its secretariat to promote and implement the programme of work approved by the General Conference and the Board of Governors.

Our general views on the activity of the Agency have already been expressed by the delegation of Spain in its statement on behalf of the European Union and associated countries. For this reason I shill make only a few specific comments on the Agency's report.

First, my delegation, like others, appreciates the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency in the fields of non-proliferation, the promotion of peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the strengthening of international cooperation in respect of nuclear safety, radiological protection and waste management. The Agency has continued to play an important role in the implementation of the various initiatives relating to the technical cooperation programme and in the introduction of a new programme to enhance the security of nuclear and radioactive material. There is no doubt that the decision on principles and objectives, adopted by the NPT Review and Extension Conference, is extremely important for the activity of the Agency because it refers to the IAEA's contribution in the fields of safeguards and the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Secondly, in our view, one of the most important tasks of the Agency remains the strengthening of the safeguards system. Certainly the Agency's system for verifying that nuclear energy is used exclusively for peaceful purposes has a vital role to play in enhancing its credibility. My country supports the measures introduced in recent years by the Agency to improve the safeguards system — in particular, through Programme "93+2", which, as delegations know very well, is aimed at increasing the cost-effectiveness of safeguards relating to declared nuclear material and at increasing the assurance of the completeness of information on nuclear activities in States with comprehensive safeguards agreements. Romania hopes for timely implementation of the measures contained in the Programme and will cooperate fully to that end.

Thirdly, in the period under consideration the Agency successfully promoted important measures in the area of nuclear safety. There is no doubt that the major accomplishment in this area was the adoption, in June 1994, of the Convention on Nuclear Safety, after three years of careful preparation and serious negotiations. In addition, the Board of Governors approved the new Basic Safety Standards in September last year. These documents contain guidelines on responsibility for the control and safety of radiation sources, as well as for the protection of workers, the general public and medical patients, together with guidelines for intervention levels in emergency situations. Both the Convention and the new Basic Safety Standards supplement the existing extensive framework of safety guidelines. It is a great pleasure for me to inform the General Assembly that my country — aware of the importance of this Convention — has already ratified it.

Of greatest importance now is full implementation of the guidelines in these major documents. The Agency has great responsibilities in this field. In particular, it must do much more in our region, where the sad Chernobyl accident occurred. Every effort should be made to enhance the safety of the existing reactors and to implement new power plants in safe conditions.

It is our duty to do everything in our power to guarantee the full protection of members of the public from exposure to radioactive materials and to prevent every possible incident giving rise to potential exposure.

We would like to underline once again the importance of regional and international cooperation in carrying out the work of the Agency pursuant to its statute, in promoting the use of nuclear energy and the application of the necessary measures to strengthen further the safety of nuclear installations and to minimize risks to life, health and environment, and in ensuring the effectiveness and efficiency of the safeguards system of the Agency.

Mr. Adekanye (Nigeria): On behalf of the Delegation of Nigeria, I wish to express our appreciation to Mr. Hans Blix, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), for his statement highlighting the activities of the Agency in the past year. Nigeria has followed with interest those activities as enumerated in the annual report (GC(39)/3) and notes the progress made in pursuit of the goals and objectives of the Agency. Those achievements reflect the widespread support of the international community as a whole for the Agency in a changing world, which would require of the secretariat of the Agency continuing commitment and of its member States stronger political resolve to make the Agency truly serve the cause of peace and development.

One of the major challenges for the Agency today is the expansion of its contribution to global solutions to the problems of poverty and underdevelopment in our world. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nigeria stated in his address at the Special Commemorative Meeting for the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations:

> "Development is a question of the human condition, and for many countries it is indeed a question of survival." *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Fiftieth Session, Plenary Meetings, 38th meeting, p. 24)*

The Agency's research and technical cooperation activities, aimed at assisting member States to achieve self-reliance in nuclear science and technology, would therefore contribute to the focus on development.

It is reassuring that the Agency's 1995-1996 Technical Cooperation Programme, approved by the Board of Governors in 1994, included 11 new model projects formulated to address the national priorities of recipient States in the areas covered by the Agency's research efforts at its Seibersdorf laboratory. The incorporation in the Technical Cooperation Programme of the conclusions of the Third Review Seminar endorsing the model project concept, more end-use orientation and a broad human-needs approach to transfer of nuclear technology is a manifestation of the Agency's capacity to adapt its machinery and policies to meet the needs of its members.

This new partnership with recipient countries, based on productive dialogue and exploiting the new country programme framework in the design of projects by member States, should be vigorously pursued even as the model project concept is extended to many more developing countries. We believe that this would enhance the impact of projects and increase public awareness of the benefits of non-military applications of nuclear energy. In the same vein, the delegation of Nigeria welcomes the new initiatives to use the institutions of developing countries, considered centres of excellence, in the implementation of selected technical cooperation projects. The primary goal should remain the strengthening of member States' capacity, regional development and cooperation among developing countries themselves.

The cooperation of member States in providing the Agency the wherewithal to implement identified projects is essential to the future of the new, better-focused Technical Cooperation Programme. Undoubtedly, the agreement reached among member States at last September's General Conference on new levels of funding for the Programme under the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Fund for the 1996-1998 period represents an important signal of that cooperation. However, that decision can only have the desired practical effect on the Agency's technical cooperation activities if it is backed by a firm commitment to provide the requisite resources.

Such support is particularly essential to the countries in the African region which cooperate under the aegis of the African Regional Cooperative Agreement (AFRA) as a vehicle for the transfer of nuclear technology through relevant region-wide projects. Nigeria's decision to agree to an extension of that Agreement for another five-year period is an affirmation of our country's continuing commitment to regional cooperation and of the important contribution of the International Atomic Energy Agency to that process. We believe that such cooperation will be further enhanced when the 7th meeting of AFRA is hosted by Nigeria next year. Simultaneously, we in Nigeria are determined to expand technical cooperation and have taken steps to strengthen the regulatory and institutional framework.

Nigeria reposes great faith in the Agency's safeguards system and has therefore always placed a high premium on its efficiency and effectiveness in strengthening confidence and trust in the non-proliferation regime. A credible, non-discriminatory verification system, implemented with vigour and professionalism, is invaluable to the peace and security of our world. The increase in the past year in the number of safeguards agreements in force in member States, as well as the high degree of compliance with the spirit and letter of these agreements, reflect positively on the safeguards system. Its integrity and continuing efficacy require not solely an assertion of the Agency's rights under safeguards agreements, as variously affirmed by the Board of Governors in the recent past, but also maximum cooperation from member States and the parties to those agreements in facilitating the work of Agency inspectors, including access to relevant data, sites and facilities.

That cooperation has contributed to the General Conference's approval of the first part of the new safeguards approaches under the so-called Programme "93+2", as well as the agreement on a new funding formula covering the next five years. We trust that member States will maintain the current momentum for reform and improvement so as to retain the confidence of the international community in the safeguards system as a whole. Moreover, this would justify the Agency's assumption of additional safeguards duties under future verification agreements, including a new comprehensive test-ban treaty and a new fissile material cut-off convention.

For the countries in the Africa region, whose firm commitment to non-proliferation is now reflected in the treaty on the African nuclear-weapon-free zone endorsed by the Organization of African Unity Council of Ministers in June 1995, the Agency's role in verifying treaty undertakings will be invaluable.

The contribution of the Agency towards the development of a culture of safety in the nuclear industry world-wide and the strengthening of institutional mechanisms towards that end provide another basis for my country's confidence in the organization. We note that member States have continued to grapple with the issue of establishing an international regime on liability for nuclear damage as a complement to the Convention on Nuclear Safety adopted last year. Together with the proposed convention on the safety of radioactive waste management, that agreement should create a strong legal framework for nuclear safety.

However, the international community's determination to confront the new menace of illicit trafficking in nuclear material, on which the Agency is now developing a valuable database, should not distract attention from the continuing need to maintain vigilance over the dumping of radioactive wastes and other highly toxic substances in the territories of developing countries. We should continue to require the effective implementation of the IAEA Code of Practice on International Transboundary Movement of Radioactive Waste to strengthen further international cooperation in this important area.

Finally, it has always been the view of my country that the Agency needs to increase representation of its member States on the Board of Governors, as part of the process of reform and democratization. Such a reform, in our view, should be based on the principles of equitable geographical distribution, transparency, accountability, effectiveness and efficiency. In particular, it should address the current underrepresentation of Africa and the Middle East and South Asia. We urge Member States not to let slip the opportunity to make the Board of Governors truly responsive to the interests of developing and developed countries as the Agency confronts the challenges of the next millennium.

Mr. Fedotov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): First of all, the Russian delegation, like other delegations, expresses its gratitude to the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Mr. Hans Blix, for the submission of the report of the Agency, which provides a broad and varied picture of the activity of the IAEA.

During the past year, events of truly historic significance have been the adoption by consensus, at the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), of a decision on an indefinite extension of that Treaty without any conditions whatever. By making this a standing Treaty, in the interest of further consolidation of the international non-proliferation regime, the participants in the Conference demonstrated a great sense of responsibility for the destiny of the world, international stability and nuclear disarmament. The Russian Federation intends to make all possible efforts to implement the decisions adopted by the NPT Conference.

The Conference emphasized the significance of the role of the IAEA in ensuring the effectiveness of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and the efforts it has been exerting to improve the safeguards system. The Conference devoted intense attention to the most urgent problems in the disarmament field. We note that the nuclear arms race has been stopped and reversed, and in 1991 an entire class of nuclear weapons of Russia and the United States were eliminated — more than 2,500 medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles. The START I Treaty, which entered into force in December 1994, decreases by nearly half two major nuclear arsenals. Next we have the forthcoming ratification of the START II Treaty, and in its framework Russia and the United States will reduce their strategic offensive weapons to one third.

Russia has consistently favoured the drawing up speedily, and no later than 1996, at the Conference on Disarmament, of a non-discriminatory comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty, subject to effective international verification. Such a treaty will strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation regime and will prevent its qualitative further development. It should also be emphasized that the new, democratic Russia has not carried out a single nuclear explosion and has firmly abided by the moratorium it has declared.

Russia reaffirms its dedication to the drawing up at the Conference on Disarmament of a multilateral, non-discriminatory and verifiable convention banning the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons. This would be an important contribution to the strengthening of the non-proliferation regime.

An initiative put forward by the President of Russia, Mr. Yeltsin, has received broad international backing — that is, the initiative on the holding in the spring of 1996 of a summit meeting on issues of nuclear security, to consider pressing problems in this area and define ways to solve them, in both the short and the long term. Such problems include ensuring the safe development of nuclear energy throughout the world and the dumping of radioactive wastes, international safeguards, and the use of nuclear materials released during the process of the elimination of nuclear weapons. In our view the IAEA could make a significant contribution to the preparations for such a meeting.

We continue to support the multifaceted activity of the Agency in such areas as halting illicit trafficking in nuclear materials, enhancing the level of their physical protection, and preparing an international convention to deal with radioactive wastes. A clear example of effective cooperation within the framework of the IAEA is the success of the international seminar held in May by the Agency, on the initiative of the Northern countries, on enhancing reliability and security in dealing with radioactive wastes.

Russia has unswervingly given priority to one of the major areas of the work of the Agency: control over the peaceful use of atomic energy and constant enhancement of the IAEA safeguards system. We note with satisfaction that the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons had a positive view of the Agency's activity in enhancing the effectiveness of the safeguards system. Russia will continue to cooperate closely with the Agency and will render its assistance in this work within the framework of the national Russian programme of support for the IAEA safeguards.

Attaching great significance to the activities of the IAEA and the development of scientific and technical cooperation between Member States, our country actively supports those programmes in which all countries are interested. Among such programmes highest priority should be given here to present and future technology for nuclear energy and its fuel cycle. The development of programmes to produce and promote new nuclear technologies and a new generation of reactors, which are promising from the point of view of security, ecology, economics and non-proliferation, must be one of the most important areas of the Agency's activity. It would be useful to begin the drafting of a comprehensive international programme for the development of nuclear energy, as a basis for solving energy, ecological and economic problems.

We attach great importance to the Agency's activities in rendering technical assistance to the developing countries. Despite the economic difficulties it has experienced, the Russian Government has found it possible to allocate to the Technical Assistance and Cooperation Fund in 1995 the sum of 5.7 billion roubles. These means are earmarked for supplying developing countries members of the Agency with Russian equipment, apparatus and facilities and also for organizing training courses and other activities in Russia.

We also support the Agency's activity in improving the security of existing nuclear power stations in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, and in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). A source of satisfaction is the work of the secretariat of the IAEA in implementing that programme. An analysis of the safety of such nuclear power stations has been successfully carried out and intensive work lies ahead to eliminate the problems which have come to light.

Of course economic difficulties are slowing down the rate of implementation of these programmes. Our country favours a broad international exchange of experience and achievements in the area of the peaceful use of nuclear energy. Today more than 30 countries are Russia's partners, and it is cooperating with them on the basis of more than 100 intergovernmental and inter-Agency agreements in force.

The most important activity of Russia's nuclear complex at the present stage is the problem of the elimination of nuclear weapons. The developing process of the reduction of nuclear weapons inevitably has required a transformation to peaceful areas of a significant part of the scientific, technical defence potential. An important step aimed at ensuring the viability of defence enterprises and their conversion and the retraining of experts is the establishment of the International Scientific Technical Centre in Moscow through the efforts of Russia, the United States, Japan and the European Union.

The Russian delegation associates itself with the co-sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/50/L.11 on the report of the IAEA for 1994.

Mr. Pak Gil Yon (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): It is regrettable to note that the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) makes reference once again to the so-called nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula in a biased, subjective and unjustified manner, disregarding the reality.

As we have clarified our position repeatedly on the so-called nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula, it is not a matter to be considered at the United Nations either in regard to its substance or in the light of its character, but is a serious political and military issue to be settled bilaterally between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States.

It is a well-known fact that the unjust discussions of the so-called nuclear issue held in the past at the United Nations have never facilitated its resolution but, on the contrary, have introduced complexity and obstacles into the process of resolving the issue.

Recently, the so-called nuclear issue is being efficiently resolved between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States in accordance with the DPRK-US Agreed Framework of October 1994.

It has been stipulated in the DPRK-US Agreed Framework that the United States should provide the light water reactor project in return for the DPRK's freeze of nuclear facilities, and the DPRK is to implement the safeguards agreement only when provision of the light water reactors is complete.

Accordingly, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has frozen the nuclear facilities and also stopped the construction of 50 megawatt and 200 megawatt reactors, subject to the Agreed Framework.

Along with this, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea accepted the 10 additional inspector designations and their continuous presence in the country as suggested by the IAEA, thus ensuring the monitoring of nuclear facilities covered by the freeze. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea also permitted verification activities of the IAEA such as containment and surveillance measures which the Agency needs to carry out so as to verify the freeze.

This clearly indicates that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea fully implements the DPRK-US Agreed Framework, which in fact goes far beyond the obligations under the safeguards agreement to be fulfilled by the DPRK, which has a special status under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

There will be no complicated problems that cannot be resolved smoothly if all international commitments are implemented as sincerely as the DPRK has implemented its commitments.

At the talks held last June in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States with respect to the implementation of the DPRK-US Agreed Framework, the United States reaffirmed its commitments to take full responsibility for providing the DPRK with the light water reactors on a turnkey basis and interim energy alternatives in return for the DPRK's freeze of nuclear facilities.

The working negotiations between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) relating to the provision of the light water reactors are now actively under way.

Despite positive developments towards a final resolution of the so-called nuclear issue, certain member States and officials of the IAEA secretariat are still resorting to meaningless argument about this so-called nuclear issue of ours. Indeed they are attempting, in a disguised manner, to use the so-called nuclear issue to create an atmosphere of pressure against the DPRK, deliberately turning their faces away from the reality that the issue is being resolved smoothly.

We are very concerned that these kinds of unjust acts by certain forces hostile to us could cast a dark shadow over the ongoing negotiations between the DPRK and KEDO. As has been proved by the whole process of resolving the so-called nuclear issue between the DPRK and the United States, no issue can be resolved if one side puts pressure on the other. Fear of pressure exerted against us has never made us give up doing what we are supposed to do.

Complete implementation of the DPRK-US Agreed Framework is a precondition for the implementation of the safeguards agreement. Therefore, urging the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to comply with the safeguards agreement at this stage, in total disregard of the reality, will only reveal the true colour of camouflaged attempts by certain forces to abuse the so-called nuclear issue in order to realize their political purposes.

We hope that the people of the world will have a correct understanding of the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula and will contribute to the implementation of the DPRK-US Agreed Framework, which will eventually lead to the final resolution of the nuclear issue.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has listened with close attention to the report presented by Mr. Hans Blix, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), on the activities of the Agency for the year 1994. The detailed information on the activities carried out over the past year are an indication of the praiseworthy leadership of the Agency by its Director General, and we extend to him once again our gratitude and congratulations and reiterate our firm support.

My country has always supported the Agency's work to promote the peaceful uses of nuclear power as a way of achieving cooperation for economic and social development of countries. Similarly, we recognize the importance of improving programmes for the protection and safety of nuclear facilities — a fundamental element in assuring non-proliferation.

The report presented today contains a detailed account of the activities of the Agency in different fields. However, we have noted that, as in previous years, a marked priority would seem to be given to the application of safeguards and verification, to the detriment of cooperation and technical assistance activities. The desire to strengthen the effectiveness and to expand the safeguards system should not relegate these activities to a secondary role.

We consider that international cooperation for the peaceful use of nuclear power and technologies continues to be the principal objective of the Agency. A better balance in its activities is indispensable today, in the face of the urgent needs of a majority of the developing countries in such varied areas as energy, human health, the environment and agriculture.

This year, with the signature of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean, known as the Tlatelolco Treaty, by the Government of Cuba, the full accession of Saint Lucia, and ratification by Saint Kitts and Nevis the international non-proliferation regime has been strengthened, thus consolidating the intention of my country and other countries of the region to make Latin America and the Caribbean the first region of the world free of nuclear weapons.

Mexico hopes that all Member States will fulfil their obligations emanating from the United Nations Charter, the statute of the IAEA and the agreements arising therefrom. Thus, my country was among those that signed the Convention on Nuclear Safety when it was opened for signature, and is on the point of concluding the internal process leading to ratification.

In this forum, we would like to appeal to countries to sign and ratify this international juridical instrument, the full entry into force of which will guarantee the trustworthy use of nuclear power. Similarly, we consider that exchanges of equipment and nuclear material should be the subject of negotiations within the framework of the Agency, with a view to ensuring that the commitments entered into are duly reflected in international instruments with clear-cut and precise rules.

My delegation welcomes the beginning of preparations in the Agency for the development of a convention on the management of radioactive wastes, and the establishment of a Standing Advisory Group on Technical Assistance and Cooperation to advise the Director General of the IAEA on technical cooperation policy and on measures to strengthen the efficiency of the Agency's programme.

My delegation is firmly convinced that for the binding, universal and non-discriminatory nature of the measures contemplated in the so-called Programme "93+2" to constitute a fundamental prerequisite in the success of this process, we need to define the terms and scope of the Agency's cooperation in this matter. In this context, my Government wishes to express its support for the decision adopted by the Board of Governors last June in approving the application of measures for the execution of which the Agency enjoys sufficient legal authority, emanating from the safeguards agreements, in order to put them into practice. We hope for an early definition of the necessary machinery to put into effect those measures for which the Agency requires additional authority.

For the Board of Governors to be really effective and representative, it should reflect the level of development achieved by member States in the nuclear area, and the increase in the number of members of the Agency as a consequence of political changes across the world and the emergence of new countries, particularly in Central and Eastern Europe. A more transparent process for the appointment of member States to the Board is essential.

Another question which we believe to be important is the careful examination by the IAEA of the possible verification functions that it could develop in the area of disarmament — particularly as we are now beginning to see significant advances towards the prompt conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Negotiations are starting, with a view to an agreement on the prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons. Full advantage should of course be taken of the long experience and recognized competence of the Agency so ably led by Mr. Hans Blix.

Ms. Diseko (South Africa): My delegation, as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.11, would like to urge its adoption.

At the landmark NPT Review and Extension Conference in New York earlier this year, the review process for the Treaty was strengthened, and a set of principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament was adopted by consensus. This led to a consensus on the indefinite extension of the NPT. South Africa, having rolled back its own nuclear-weapons programme, was keen to ensure that the Treaty was strengthened for the benefit of all humanity so as to advance to a nuclear-weapon-free world. We regard the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in verifying and assessing compliance with safeguards agreements as a vital component of the success of the Treaty.

Flowing logically from the NPT Conference will be a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty (CTBT), with 1996 as the target date for its conclusion. The NPT Conference, after extensive consultations, including consultations with the nuclear-weapon States, called on all the parties concerned to exercise "utmost restraint", pending the entry into force of a CTBT. My Government, therefore, strongly supported and co-sponsored a resolution at the IAEA General Conference in September which expressed grave concern at the resumption and continuation of nuclear testing by certain countries. I would like to repeat that concern here today, and call on the parties involved to cease nuclear testing immediately.

As the Assembly will be aware, South Africa is once again the designated member for Africa on the Board of Governors of the IAEA, after an absence of 17 years, and we are looking forward to playing an active role in the work of this important Agency. My delegation would like to commend the work of the Director General and the IAEA over the past year, as reflected in the report before us today.

In particular, we fully support the programme to strengthen the effectiveness and improve the efficiency of the safeguards system. Given developments in Iraq, in particular over the past year, it has become only too apparent that strengthening of the safeguards system is essential if similar situations are to be avoided in future and the objectives of non-proliferation achieved.

At the same time, I wish to emphasize our desire that the Agency continue to devote all available resources to the provision of technical assistance to the developing world, thereby bringing the benefits of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and technology to all nations. It is vital that this role be perceived by all as being of equal importance to the Agency as its safeguards role. We in South Africa are hoping to play a useful role in ensuring that this objective is met.

The Acting President: I now call on the representative of Iraq to introduce the amendment to draft resolution A/50/L.11 contained in document A/50/L.12.

Mr. Hasan (Iraq): It is my pleasure to introduce my delegation's amendment, circulated in document A/50/L.12, to the draft resolution entitled "Report of the International Atomic Energy Agency" (A/50/L.11).

First of all, I should like to reiterate our position on the draft resolutions that have been presented under this item. My delegation thinks — and many delegations share our view — that draft resolutions under this item should avoid controversial political issues and assessments. Unfortunately, this has not been the case in the last few years, and in particular it is not the case with the draft resolution presented this year.

Concerning operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution, which deals with Iraq's implementation of Security Council resolution 687 (1991) and 715 (1991), my delegation considers that this paragraph does not reflect in a fair and objective manner the cooperative relationship between Iraq and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), or the real stage of advancement of the IAEA's work under relevant Security Council resolutions. We are aware of the fact that political motivations are behind this attempt. The first of these is to prolong the comprehensive regime of sanctions imposed on my country, if not to change it to an open-ended one.

Our first amendment to this paragraph refers to the IAEA's assessment of the advancement of its work. The amendment puts the question of the information provided by Iraq this year in its real and exact context. This means, as has been stated in the IAEA's report to the Security Council, that this information did not change the IAEA's conclusion that Iraq's nuclear-weapon programme has been, for all practical purposes, destroyed, removed or rendered harmless. Furthermore, this morning Mr. Hans Blix, the Director General of the IAEA, in his address to this Assembly, reiterated this fact, saying:

> "As I reported to the General Assembly last year, it is our conclusion that the essential components of Iraq's clandestine nuclear-weapon programme have been identified and destroyed, removed or rendered harmless". *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Fiftieth Session, Plenary Meetings, 46th meeting, p. 4).*

Mr. Blix added that

> "This assessment was not based on faith in Iraqi statements, but on data gathered during inspection, on information provided by the suppliers and Member States and, to a great extent, on analysis of the large number of original documents which were obtained in Iraq early in the inspection process". *(ibid., p. 4).*

Furthermore, it is worth mentioning in this context that the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations entitled "Verification in all its aspects" (A/50/377) stated in the paragraph on the experience of the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the IAEA in Iraq, that

> "withholding of some of the data by Iraq was overcome, in large part, by the extraordinary inspection rights of UNSCOM and the IAEA on a short- or no-notice basis". *(A/50/377, para. 197).*

Based on these facts and assessments, it is clear that the exaggerations about the issue of information are not logical, fair or factual and should not be taken out of context — as has happened in the draft resolution — bearing in mind that Iraq provided all the information needed by the IAEA and expresses willingness to provide further details needed by the IAEA.

For these reasons, my delegation has presented our amendment — a paragraph from the IAEA's report to the Security Council — in order to introduce balance into operative paragraph 7.

Our second amendment would replace the words "stresses the need for Iraq to cooperate fully with the Agency" with the words "stresses the need for Iraq to continue its cooperation with the Agency". I should like to remind representatives that Iraq proposed the same amendment last year, and it was adopted by a vote in this Assembly. My delegation expresses its deep regret that some of the sponsors of the draft resolution did not take into consideration the will of the General Assembly in this matter. Nevertheless, my delegation noted with satisfaction the statement made this morning by His Excellency the Ambassador of Spain on behalf of the European Union. He said that

> "long-term success can be ensured only if Iraq continues to cooperate fully with the IAEA" *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Fiftieth Session, Plenary Meetings, 46th meeting, p. 10).*

I should like on this occasion to reiterate our commitment to continue our cooperation with the IAEA in the fulfilment of its mandate.

Finally, my delegation hopes that the Assembly will consider positively our factual and fair amendment.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

I should like to announce that the following countries have become co-sponsors of draft resolution A/50/L.11: El Salvador, Latvia and the Russian Federation.

We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/50/L.11 and the amendments thereto contained in document A/50/L.12.

I shall now call on representatives who wish to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting.

May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Ladsous (France) *(interpretation from French)*: The penultimate preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/50/L.11 contains a reference to the resolution GC(39)/RES/23, which was adopted on 22 September 1995 by the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and which deals with nuclear testing.

When that text was adopted at Vienna the French delegation pointed out that it did not feel it could associate itself with the statements or judgements contained in the resolution, above and beyond the problem of the competence of the General Conference. For that reason the French delegation will abstain in the voting on the penultimate preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. This is also why, this year, France has not been a sponsor of the draft resolution.

In this connection, however, the French delegation wishes to reaffirm in forceful terms its full support for the action of the International Atomic Energy Agency and for its Director General, Mr. Blix.

Mr. Kumar (India): As a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) since its inception in 1957, India has consistently attached the highest importance to its objectives. We actively participate in the activities of the Agency. Since draft resolution A/50/L.11 pertains to the activities of the IAEA as a whole, to which we attach great value, we would go along with the draft resolution. However, we have considerable difficulty with the fourth preambular paragraph.

The language of the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution indicates a linkage between adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the freedom to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. I quote article II of the IAEA statute, which reads:

> "The Agency shall seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. It shall ensure, so far as it is able, that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose."

Furthermore, article IV C states:

> "The Agency is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members ...".

The purpose of these articles in the IAEA statute is obviously to encourage unfettered access by member States to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy without any discrimination whatsoever, since any perceived discrimination will have an inevitable consequence on the response of member States to their obligations to the Agency. The NPT is a separate instrument and cannot be used to create a differential between members of the Agency.

By inferring that adherence to the NPT, on which my Government's views are well known, has a bearing on access to peaceful uses of atomic energy, the draft resolution deviates from the objectives enshrined in the statute.

We have, therefore, been constrained to call for a separate vote on the fourth preambular paragraph.

Mr. Pak Gil Yon (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula is a political and military one, in terms of its origin and nature, which can be resolved only by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States. In the past, the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have handled the issue unreasonably, hindering rather than helping its settlement.

The draft resolution before us, sponsored by certain countries, again refers to us unfairly. The sponsors of the draft resolution have attempted to turn their faces away from the realities by urging us to comply with the safeguards agreement, and by trying to disregard the DPRK-US Agreed Framework. How could we fully comply with the safeguards agreement when the DPRK-US Agreed Framework has not been implemented?

The DPRK-US Agreed Framework stipulates the obligations to be carried out by the DPRK and the United States, respectively, for the final resolution of the nuclear issue. It especially identifies the stage at which the DPRK should comply fully with the safeguards agreement.

Draft resolution A/50/L.11 reveals the ulterior intentions of certain co-sponsors to abuse the name of the United Nations as a means of pressure on us. They should bear in mind that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a dignified country that regards independence as its life, and any attempt whatsoever to put pressure upon us is completely unacceptable.

The delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea strongly rejects draft resolution A/50/L.11 as an attempt of indecent forces to create an atmosphere unfavourable to us and to dilute the significance of the DPRK-US Agreed Framework in order to lay obstacles in the way of a resolution of the nuclear issues on the Korean Peninsula.

Actually, the draft resolution gives us the impression that the United Nations Security Council and the IAEA are opposed to the DPRK-US Agreed Framework. Therefore, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will vote against draft resolution A/50/L.11.

Mr. Kirkland (United States of America): The Iraqi amendment, particularly the second part of it, attempts to turn around completely the facts about Iraq's programme. Last year, the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on Iraq's nuclear programme did speak about Iraq's cooperation in one particular area, the establishment of the monitoring programme. This year, the words "cooperation" and "cooperate" do not appear a single time in the IAEA report. The reason why should be obvious. Iraq has been forced to admit that it concealed huge amounts of information, including the fact that it had repeatedly violated Security Council resolutions, and it is continuing this concealment today. Iraq is not "cooperating", and thus it is not "continuing to cooperate," and to include such a phrase in the draft resolution would be simply contrary to fact.

The first part of the amendment selects the only passage from the IAEA report which is not completely negative about Iraq. This selection does not serve the truth. It is not new news, and it is not acceptable to the co-sponsors.

We urge all delegations to vote against this amendment and to support the draft resolution as it stands.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/50/L.11 and on the amendment thereto contained in document A/50/L.12.

In accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, the amendment is voted on first. The Assembly will therefore take a decision first on the amendment circulated in document A/50/L.12.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Sudan

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia

Abstaining:

Bangladesh, Botswana, Burundi, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Mauritius, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe

The amendment was rejected by 95 votes to 8, with 22 abstentions.

The Acting President: the Assembly will now turn to draft resolution A/50/L.11.

Separate votes have been requested on the fourth and eleventh preambular paragraphs and on operative paragraph 7.

Is there any objection to those requests?

Since there is none, I shall put those paragraphs to the vote separately.

I put to the vote first the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/50/L.11. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia

Against:

India, Israel, Saudi Arabia

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Pakistan, Sudan, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe

The fourth preambular paragraph was adopted by 128 votes to 3, with 7 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Saudi Arabia advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: I next put to the vote the eleventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/50/L.11.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Cambodia, China, Côte d'Ivoire, France, Gabon, Monaco, Sudan, Togo, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam

The eleventh preambular paragraph was adopted by 121 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Acting President: I now put to the vote operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/50/L.11.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia

Against:

None

Abstaining:

China, Cuba, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan, Sudan, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe

Operative paragraph 7 was adopted by 128 votes to none, with 10 abstentions.

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution A/50/L.11 as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

Abstaining:

China, Cuba, Ghana, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/50/L.11 as a whole was adopted by 144 votes to 1, with 8 abstentions (resolution 50/9).

[Subsequently, the delegations of Dominica and the United Republic of Tanzania advised the Secretariat that they intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Wu Chengjiang (China) *(interpretation from Chinese):* The Chinese delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/50/L.11, on the report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). China is of the view that the General Assembly's draft resolution on the report of the IAEA should not include negative references to specific countries, for such a pressure tactic will not only fail to contribute to the solution of problems but may also complicate matters even further. The Chinese delegation has reservations on some of the resolutions of the Board of Governors and of the General Conference of the IAEA that are mentioned in the draft resolution. For these reasons the Chinese delegation abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

This, however, is without prejudice to China's views on the Agency's activities. In his statement this morning the Chinese representative offered a comprehensive and positive assessment of the Agency's work in the year under review.

Mr. Hasan (Iraq): My delegation lost its right to vote in the General Assembly for reasons beyond its control — namely, the comprehensive embargo imposed by Security Council resolutions and the freezing of its assets abroad.

However, if we did have the right to vote, my delegation would have abstained in the voting on operative paragraph 7 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Serme (Burkina Faso) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of Burkina Faso voted against the amendment to draft resolution A/50/L.11 submitted by Iraq and contained in document A/50/L.12. Our delegation wishes to stress that if there had been a separate vote on each of the two paragraphs of the amendment, it would have voted in favour of paragraph (a) because of its factual nature. That paragraph reproduces the terms of the Agency's report submitted to the Security Council on 6 October 1995 and is also in keeping with the conclusions described by the Director General of the Agency in his presentation of the report this morning. My delegation would have voted against paragraph (b) of the proposed amendment because the original version reproduced the terms of the resolution referred to in paragraph 7 of the draft resolution.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): Israel supported the draft resolution as a whole. However, it is our firm position that the application of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes should be conducted, as prescribed by the Agency's statute, on a basis of equality, regardless of whether or not a State member of the Agency is a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Therefore, Israel opposed the fourth preambular paragraph of the draft resolution and voted against it.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to make statements in exercise of the right of reply.

May I remind members that statements in the exercise of the right of reply are limited to 10 minutes for the first intervention and to five minutes for the second intervention and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Pak Gil Yon (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): This morning the South Korean representative spoke about our "non-compliance" with the safeguards agreement, and he also defined the DPRK-US Agreed Framework as a complementary device to induce us to comply with the safeguards agreement. Unless it is South Korea's ulterior intention to impede the implementation of the Agreed Framework, I think he may be ignorant of the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula. I therefore think it useful to take this opportunity to educate him on the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula.

The DPRK-US Agreed Framework, which was welcomed by the Security Council and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), clearly stipulates the obligations to be implemented by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States, respectively, and identifies explicitly a certain stage at which the DPRK is to cooperate fully with the IAEA. The DPRK-US Agreed Framework is for the final resolution of the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula.

I advise the representative of South Korea to read carefully the statement made this morning by the representative of the United States. We are not fools to be induced into something by false documents — if that is what the Agreed Framework is. We therefore suspect that the representative of South Korea may be an ignorant person who cannot even understand clearly the Agreed Framework, one of the important international documents of our times.

Only today South Korea revealed its sinister intention to lay obstacles in the path of implementation of the Agreed Framework between the United States of America and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and thus save face since it could not intervene in the talks between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States. What South Korea should bear in mind is that the dogs may bark but the train moves on.

Mr. Chon (Republic of Korea): North Korea put forward the Agreed Framework as an excuse for non-compliance with the safeguards agreement under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). North Korea is, of course, obligated to implement the Agreed Framework, just as it is obligated to abide by the South/North joint declaration on the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula signed in December 1991.

We have no doubt that these bilateral arrangements are important for the ultimate resolution of the North

Korean nuclear issue. However, from the multilateral perspective of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), these bilateral arrangements have relevance and significance by virtue of the way in which they can strengthen the global non-proliferation regime. As such, the Agreed Framework can be a supplementary step, in support of multilateral efforts under the auspices of the Security Council and the IAEA, towards resolving the North Korean nuclear issue; it cannot replace, supersede or detract from North Korea's multilateral obligations to all States parties to the NPT.

Acting upon the Agreed Framework, the Security Council, in its presidential statement of 4 November 1994 (S/PRST/1994/64), underlined that the safeguards agreement between the IAEA and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea remains binding and in force. As long as the safeguards agreement remains binding and in force, it is clear that North Korea has the legal obligation to comply fully with the terms of an agreement it entered into of its own free will. When it does not, that constitutes an act of non-compliance.

Given the important responsibility of this world body to monitor and ensure compliance by States parties with their commitments under the NPT and safeguard agreements, we feel we can take it for granted that the Assembly registers due concern over North Korea's continuing non-compliance with its safeguards agreement, and urges North Korea to come promptly into full compliance.

The IAEA General Conference sent an unmistakable message to this effect when, at its thirty-ninth session, last September, it adopted the resolution on the North Korean nuclear issue without a single vote against. We are pleased that this world body has just endorsed the resolution by the General Conference on the IAEA on the non-compliance by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with its safeguards agreement.

Mr. Pak Gil Yon (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The South Korean representative has once again revealed his ignorance. I should like to advise him to read carefully the Agreed Framework between the United States and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Agreed Framework was welcomed by the Security Council and the IAEA. It stipulates when we should cooperate fully with the IAEA, and I wish to state clearly, once again, that any resolution in any organization is worthless if the Agreed Framework is not implemented.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 14?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 156 *(continued)*

Multilingualism

Draft resolution (A/50/L.6/Rev.1)

Amendments (A/50/L.8 and A/50/L.9)

The Acting President: I call on the representative of France to introduce the revised draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.6/Rev.1.

Mr. Ladsous (France) *(interpretation from French)*: I should like to introduce the revised version of draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1, which was distributed as an official document yesterday and on which we will be taking a vote.

The only paragraph of the draft which differs from the version of the text distributed previously is operative paragraph 3, and I should say right away that the sponsors have striven in this paragraph to take as much account as possible of the legitimate concerns expressed by some delegations, in particular within the Asian Group.

These delegations have asked us to show some sympathy for the situation of nationals of countries which do not commonly use one of the official languages of the United Nations. It seemed to them too much to ask that on recruitment, all United Nations staff members should speak two of the official languages, at least one of which must be a working language. This, they said, imposed on them a need to acquire two languages in order to join the Organization, which could be discriminatory in favour of the nationals of countries which use one of the official languages and who would thus have to acquire only one more language in order to enter the Organization.

However, some of the Asian representatives told us they saw no obstacle to the practice of a second official language being encouraged strongly within the Organization and that account should be taken of the efforts in this regard by officials who, during their careers, acquire a degree of linguistic competence which no one can deny is of great importance for an Organization such as ours.

The sponsors agreed entirely with this point of view and therefore took a major step towards the position of the countries which had made that comment. This was not a matter of course: it meant giving up an element introduced in draft resolution A/50/L.6 — the requirement for a second official language on recruitment, which was new. In this regard, the revised draft reverts to the legal status quo going back to resolution 2480 B (XXIII) of 21 December 1968.

I would stress that there is no difference between new paragraph 3 and what derives from the set of provisions in resolution 2480 B (XXIII): the recruitment requirement of proficiency in at least one of the working languages of the Secretariat reproduces subparagraph 1 (*a*) (i) of the 1968 resolution and the fact that it is nevertheless possible to recruit, on contracts of under two years, people who speak one of the working languages of an organ of the United Nations to fill posts in services working for those organs reproduces the next subparagraph of subparagraph 1 (*a*).

The request that the use of a second official language be taken into account when promotions and incremental steps are under consideration is precisely what emerges from the two subparagraphs of subparagraph 1 (*b*) and paragraph 3. The provisions of the resolution of 1968 make it clear that promotions are subject to

> "Adequate and confirmed knowledge of a second language". (*resolution 2480 B (XXIII), para. 1 (b) (ii)*)

When we say, in our text, that due account must be taken of such knowledge we are not going beyond the 1968 text — quite the contrary. We stick to reaffirming the 1968 text, without any addition. Also, the notion of linguistic balance within the Organization is itself drawn from the *chapeau* to paragraph 1 of resolution 2480 B (XXIII).

This being the case, I ask all delegations here to please understand that the sponsors went as far as they possibly could while still staying true to their own draft. As I said when I presented it almost a fortnight ago, this draft is in no way a modification of the law in force in the United Nations: rather, it is an appeal for the fundamental provisions governing United Nations practice with regard to languages to be better observed, accorded more respect and more fully applied.

I believe that this is a very strong imperative on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary, at a time when a regrettable drift towards monolingualism is becoming more widespread and more entrenched. Hence, the sponsors, though they would like to see the text adopted by consensus, are determined not to give in to manoeuvres that are all-too-obviously designed to intimidate. The proposed amendments that have been circulated to Member States by one delegation are totally unacceptable in this connection because they would all have the effect of reducing the scope of the text to nothing and of causing a regression in current United Nations practice towards impoverishment, towards discrimination in favour of a single Secretariat language, and towards the death of any United Nations action to promote cultural diversity. That is why France, in solidarity with all the other sponsors of the draft resolution — and I should point out in this connection that the following countries have been added to the list: Afghanistan, Cape Verde, China, Kazakstan and the Lao People's Democratic Republic — feels that the draft resolutions, in its revised form, is a compromise that should be acceptable to all delegations of good will that do not want to depart from the rules on these matters that the Organization has built up over the course of its history.

I therefore commend this text to all our colleagues and ask them not to accept without substantiation the allegations on its supposed content that have been made by one delegation and thus demonstrate their commitment to a living and effective United Nations that truly works in diversity, to the benefit of the Member States.

Mr. Deineko (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): As has been noted by the General Assembly on many occasions, the use of different languages in the United Nations enriches the Organization and is a means of achieving the purposes set out in the Charter. On many occasions, the General Assembly has reaffirmed the need to ensure equal treatment of the official and working languages of the Organization, in accordance with the Assembly's rules of procedure. The fact that there are both official and working languages and the status accorded them under the rules of procedure reflect the universal nature of the Organization and, in a mediated form, of the cultural diversity of the international community.

The political importance of this question is obvious right now, just as the results of the Organization's first 50 years' work are being reviewed. The experience acquired over those years shows that the United Nations has succeeded in striking an extremely successful balance between the need for the fullest possible reflection of the world's linguistic and cultural diversity and considerations of ensuring the viability of the Organization's machinery. It is precisely this factor which, of all others, has made possible the harmonious integration of new countries into the practical activities of the United Nations — and the current membership exceeds by far the number of founding States. Of course, this all has to do with the events of the past few years and the accession to active participation of new, independent States that can use, within the Organization, a language that a majority of their citizens know.

Naturally, the legally backed principle of the equality of the official and working languages — a principle that has stood the test of time — ought to be reaffirmed by the Assembly. Nor is it any less important to adopt measures that would make it possible to avoid violations of that principle. Here, the important thing is to ensure that Member States are simultaneously provided with equal services — equal in terms of both volume and quality — in all languages, official and working.

In that light, the Russian delegation joined the sponsors of the original draft resolution on multilingualism, and guided by the spirit of compromise and having tried to ensure that the comments expressed at previous meetings were taken into account as fully as possible, is prepared to support the draft in its revised form.

Mr. Shongwe (Swaziland): My delegation has a problem with regard to this draft resolution, which seeks to outlaw some bona fide Members of the United Nations. Let it be said that in the past 50 years the question of language has never been in any way responsible for either the failures or the successes of the Organization.

Instead, unity of purpose and political will have been the paramount factor in the strength and operation of the United Nations, and it is on this that the Organization is entirely dependent. This draft resolution will tend to create a split among the Member States at a time when unity among them is a prerequisite for the success of the Organization.

My delegation, through you, Sir, appeals to the Assembly to spend its energy, time and effort on those issues that pertain to development, especially of the developing nations. This draft resolution, if adopted, will have negative financial implications for the developing nations. It will also require that budgets be set aside by both the United Nations and the Member States towards manpower development for purposes of meeting the demands of the draft resolution.

My delegation therefore urges the Assembly to reject this draft resolution or defer the voting for further consultations.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in the debate on this item.

I call on the representative of the United States, who has asked to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Birenbaum (United States of America): The United States believes that further time is needed for discussions with the co-sponsors of the text contained in document A/50/L.6/Rev.1 in order to seek to achieve consensus on the draft resolution.

As a multicultural society, the United States fully appreciates and respects the value of multilingualism. For this reason, we attach considerable importance to adopting a forward-looking resolution under this item and doing that by consensus. Unfortunately, the text we have before us contains ambiguities and inconsistencies. We regret that there has not been adequate opportunity to discuss the provisions of draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1 with its co-sponsors, although that would surely be the appropriate way to proceed.

As a result, portions of the text remain unacceptable. Our principal concern is that operative paragraph 3, even as revised, deviates from the current rules contained in General Assembly resolution 2480 (XXIII) B. Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1, for example, does not conform to that earlier resolution. Provisions in that resolution relating to promotions apply only to professional-level positions. Any revision of the rules must first be given due consideration by the appropriate committee of the General Assembly. That important step has been skipped in formulating this draft resolution. We believe that this concern can be met by appropriate consultations that could result in a consensus text.

If we are required to consider this draft resolution today, we, along with other delegations, will have no choice other than to vote against it. That is not a desirable way to deal with this important matter and that is not the way we would prefer. We would strongly prefer that a reasonable time be allowed for those of us who have problems with the draft resolution to consult with the co-sponsors with a view to reaching consensus. If the objective of the co-sponsors is to reaffirm our shared commitment to multilingualism at the United Nations, and not to change the relevant rules, I can assure them that there should be no difficulty in achieving consensus after appropriate consultation.

There is no compelling reason why the draft resolution before us must be adopted today. Why not take the time necessary to bring the world together on this text so that we can all join in adopting by consensus a resolution on the subject of multilingualism?

I move, under rule 74 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, to defer consideration of this item to a future meeting later this month, after the conclusion of consultations. We would hope that we can look to the President's good offices to organize these consultations.

The Acting President: The representative of the United States has moved, within the terms of rule 74 of the rules of procedure, the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion until later this month.

According to rule 74 of the rules of procedure:

> "During the discussion of any matter, a representative may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, two representatives may speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. The President may limit the time to be allowed to speakers under this rule."

I call on the representative of Japan.

Mr. Kumamaru (Japan): The draft resolution before us is of great interest and great importance to my delegation as well as to many others. My delegation supports the preservation and promotion of cultural diversity in this Organization. It believes that multilingualism is one important factor in doing this.

However, we should all be aware that there are numerous cultures not associated with the six official languages. Personnel who come from those cultures should not be penalized and unduly discriminated against. Fairer treatment of these people would serve the overall objectives of cultural diversity.

The second part of paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1 would give advantage to personnel whose mother tongue is one of the six languages and would penalize those whose mother tongue is not one of those six. The latter deserve due consideration and fair competition. Unfortunately, therefore, paragraph 3, as revised, does not meet our modest request.

In the view of my delegation, this draft resolution is too important for us to deal with in a hasty manner. Careful consideration by as many delegations as possible would contribute to the improvement of the draft resolution and to its successful adoption by consensus. Unfortunately, no real consultation has taken place so far.

My delegation seconds the proposal put forward by the United States delegation to defer action on a resolution so that the resolution will be blessed with adoption by consensus.

The Acting President: I now call on the representative of Fiji.

Mr. Bune (Fiji): My country also attaches great importance to this item and we therefore support the motion that a decision on this draft resolution be deferred until we have had further consultations with a view to adopting a resolution by consensus.

We understand the preoccupation of those who are concerned that the proceedings of the Organization be conducted in all the official languages and that the documentation of the Organization be made available simultaneously. However, that is different from trying to impose additional foreign languages on nationals of States whose mother tongue is not one of the six official languages of the Organization. It is difficult enough for them to communicate in one of these official languages.

We recognize that there are two working languages of the Secretariat and that these should be used as far as practicable. The Secretariat has worked quite well for the past 50 years. Perhaps its use of languages should be improved, but to create conditions for recruitment and promotion within the Secretariat of the kind envisaged in the draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.6/Rev.1 is deliberately to discriminate against nationals of States whose mother tongue is not one of the official languages of the Organization or of the Secretariat.

There is in fact nothing wrong with the present rules regarding language. The problem is that the Organization does not provide enough resources in the form of interpretation, translation and other aspects of document services. This cannot be resolved by imposing the discriminatory conditions contained in the draft resolution.

Since the purpose of this draft resolution is to change the Secretariat's recruitment and promotion rules, we believe that this matter should first be considered in the administrative and budgetary Committee, since there are both administrative and budgetary implications. In any case, a decision on this draft resolution should be deferred until we have had further consultations and I therefore support the motion made by the representative of the United States of America.

The Acting President: I call on the representative of Argentina.

Mrs. Fernández de Gurmendi (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): A proposal has been made to defer the debate on the draft resolution on multilingualism. However, this draft resolution which we are considering today is practically identical to the one which has been considered by delegations for two weeks, since 20 October, when we met in this Hall to deal with this item.

Since that day, some delegations have expressed to us their concerns on one of the paragraphs of the draft resolution, operative paragraph 3. It was pointed out to us that this paragraph would result in a modification of the system of recruitment and promotion of staff.

In response to those concerns, the co-sponsors of the draft resolution began a process of consultations, which led to the revised version now before the Assembly. In the new version, operative paragraph 3 has been modified in such a way that it is limited to summarizing the existing rules in the matter contained in Assembly resolution 2480 B (XXIII) of 1968 which relates to the linguistic abilities of personnel.

With this modification, the draft resolution we are considering is in its totality confined to reaffirming resolutions and other provisions which are in force with regard to the use of the Organization's official and working languages, and to highlighting the need to strictly respect these provisions. There has been no modification of any of the existing provisions; there has been no amendment of the system of recruitment and promotion of staff.

In the light of what I have said and of the process of consultations which has taken place since 20 October, it does not seem reasonable for delegations and the Organization to continue to allocate time and attention to the consideration of a question which in no way changes the existing system.

In those circumstances, we consider that the process of consultations has been concluded and that the motion to defer the adoption of a decision on this question should be rejected. We hope a decision can be adopted today.

The Acting President: I call on the representative of France.

Mr. Ladsous (France) (*interpretation from French*): I am speaking in order to request members of the Assembly not to vote in favour of this motion for adjournment that has just been presented under rule 74 of the rules of procedure.

I should like to say first of all that France, with all the co-sponsors of the draft resolution submitted to the Assembly, has engaged in extremely broad consultations on this text since this item was inscribed as a new item on the agenda of this session. In this connection, I should like to respond to my colleague from Japan by saying that he should take into account the fact that these consultations took place. All the requested amendments which were based on important and legitimate concerns of some States, and which could be included without distorting the text, have been included in our revised draft that members of the Assembly have before them.

Hence, we have reached the conclusion that additional consultations would not at this stage be likely to improve the draft resolution. We think that the proposal made by the delegation which presented the motion for adjournment is not, in fact, designed to improve the text, but, rather, would deprive it of any practical effect, and render it totally meaningless.

I regret that I have to say this, but the motion does not seem to us to be made in good faith. It seems to us that it is nothing but a delaying tactic designed to bury this draft resolution, or defer it *sine die*, indeed to bury it in the sand, from which it may emerge only in an unrecognizable form, if that.

I think that no one here is deceived by the deep meaning of this operation. In fact, the idea is to have us endorse a monolingual trend, which is only too obvious in the Secretariat and in the United Nations organ as a whole.

We also had hoped that this text could be adopted by consensus, and we believe we have done all in our power to achieve that goal. But if an effort is being made to force us to move backwards, and to stop championing the linguistic principles of the Organization, then we believe it is our duty not to yield, regardless of the source of the pressures.

That is why, Sir, through you I should like to request all delegations to vote against the motion for adjournment presented under rule 74.

The Acting President: We have heard two speakers in favour of and two against the motion. In accordance with rule 74 of the rules of procedure I shall now put to the vote immediately the motion to adjourn the debate on the item under discussion until later in the month.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Croatia, Cyprus, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Lithuania, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam

Abstaining:

Belgium, Czech Republic, Kazakstan, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Yemen

The motion was rejected by 75 votes to 70, with 6 abstentions.

The Acting President: The Assembly will continue consideration of agenda item 156, "Multilingualism", as the second item tomorrow morning.

The meeting rose at 6:20 p.m.

United Nations

A/50/PV.48

General Assembly

Fiftieth Session

Official Records

48th plenary meeting
Thursday, 2 November 1995, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Freitas do Amaral . . . . (Portugal)

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

In the absence of the President, Mr. Berrocal Soto (Costa Rica), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Agenda item 27

Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba

Report of the Secretary-General (A/49/401 and Add.1)

Draft resolution (A/50/L.10)

The Acting President (*interpretation from Spanish*): I call on the representative of Cuba to introduce draft resolution A/50/L.10.

Mr. Rodríguez Parrilla (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is quite a paradox that in the midst of the celebrations for the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, and for the fourth consecutive year, my country finds itself once again obliged to condemn one of the most flagrant acts of aggression ever committed against any people. This act is all the more serious and reprehensible in that it is being committed by a world super-Power against a small and proud nation, such as the one that I have the honour of representing.

This is the case of the economic, commercial and financial blockade that for more than 34 years has been imposed by the Government of the United States against Cuba, in violation of the most fundamental norms of international law, of peaceful coexistence among sovereign and independent nations, and of freedom of trade and navigation.

Furthermore, it is regrettable that this systematic and reinforced policy of economic strangulation of the Cuban people throughout the country's economic and social life is being carried out in open defiance of the international community and ignoring three successive resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. Those resolutions, adopted by an increasingly wide majority, have stated the need to put an end to the blockade against Cuba and rejected its extraterritorial nature.

It is an indisputable fact that the blockade against Cuba is continuing and being intensified.

Not only is the group of laws and regulations governing this policy of permanent economic aggression still in force, but new steps are being taken to strengthen and expand them, particularly as concerns their extraterritorial implications for third States. Actions to this end have just been approved by the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States Congress.

95-86495 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Today as never before, and in the most diverse ways, the blockade continues to affect the recovery of the Cuban economy and the living standards of our people. Today again, an entire arsenal of mechanisms and procedures is being fully deployed and fine-tuned, in order accurately to monitor Cuba's external economic relations and to ensure the extraterritorial implementation of the blockade by, *inter alia*, bringing a broad range of pressures to bear on Cuba's potential economic partners, and through a relentless persecution, which includes working covertly against Cuba's economic activities abroad, especially those relating to capital investments and crucial areas of the Cuban economy.

The so-called "Torricelli Act" of 1992, whose basic goal is to cut off Cuba's trade with subsidiaries of United States companies based in third countries, and which was strongly rejected in this very forum, is still fully in force in the legal system of that country and is being strictly implemented according to its statutory provisions.

As a result of the provisions introduced by that Act against freedom of trade and navigation, most carriers are demanding higher-than-normal freight charges from Cuba, claiming that if they enter any Cuban port, their ships will not be admitted to any United States port until 180 days have elapsed. For example, in the state of Virginia, the authorities have included, in the official port-related documentation required of carriers, an affidavit stating that they have not entered any Cuban port for 180 days prior to their arrival in Virginia.

Owing to the surcharge on some imported goods that the blockade obliges us to purchase in markets that are far distant from Cuba's natural trading environment, and because of the increase in transport costs, the loss to our national economy is reported to have increased to $60 million during 1994, and the figure is approximately the same for this year.

Moreover, in 1994 and 1995 trade between Cuba and subsidiaries of United States companies based in third countries have been reduced to virtually zero — although such trade had amounted to $718 million in 1991 — owing to the suspension of licenses issued by the Treasury Department as part of the extraterritorial effects of the aforementioned Act, thereby seriously affecting our purchases of foodstuffs and medicines for our people.

Moreover, there is still a ban on any foreign company's selling to Cuba medications, medical equipment or medical supplies that may contain components or technology of United States origin, even if the company involved is not a subsidiary of a United States corporation. As can be seen from the Secretary-General's report, the most recent effects of this type of regulation is the damages that have been incurred by companies from the United Kingdom, Denmark, Germany, Belgium, Italy and Australia, *inter alia*, which have historically had trade transactions with Cuba.

All in all, taking into account the revenues not received and the additional disbursements caused by the blockade, the total damage to the Cuban economy in 1994 is estimated at more than $1 billion, which accounts for 50 per cent of the country's total imports for that year. This is in addition to damages reported to the Assembly in prior years.

The Secretary-General's report contains detailed information on the damage caused to our country's economy and to our people's quality of life, as well as on some of the actions taken to frustrate Cuba's trade operations with third Governments and companies that are not subject to United States jurisdiction, which provides further evidence of the extraterritorial nature of the United States policy against my country.

Similarly, it is hard to believe that these actions have gone so far as to pressure the Governments of some developing countries into not buying new products, some of them unique, of Cuba's biotechnological industry, with no thought for the thousands of lives that our vaccines and other medicines, which are of proven effectiveness, could help save.

Yet the people of Cuba, and in particular our children, our pregnant women, our senior citizens and the ill, are daily victims of the continuing and stepped-up blockade against Cuba. Ever-greater damage is being done in the areas of health and education, two spheres in which our people, and people throughout the developing world, have always taken pride.

The Secretary-General's report clearly describes the impact of this policy on the decreasing nutritional levels of the Cuban population, and makes reference to the emergence of hitherto unheard-of health problems among the sectors that are most at risk, a fact that has been corroborated by international bodies and United Nations organs.

One example will suffice to illustrate the criminal nature of the blockade: the only two companies, both of them in third countries, that supplied pacemakers for patients suffering from heart disease have stopped doing so, one because the devices contained components made in the United States and the other because it was absorbed by a company based in the United States.

Our united and heroic people have endured the consequences of the blockade with great suffering and daily shortages. At a time when the United Nations is commemorating its fiftieth anniversary, it is deplorable that an entire people should be suffering as a result of a unilateral political decision. It is hard to believe that this crime, which could also be stopped by a unilateral political decision on the part of the United States, should continue to be committed day after day.

If the consequences of this aggressive policy against us have not been worse, if there are no Cuban homeless, if not one health or educational centre in our country has been shut down, if we have managed to maintain our very low rates of mortality and morbidity, it has been thanks to the excellent Cuban health-care and educational systems and to the full-time dedication of the people who work in our centres, as well as to the assistance provided by our institutions and to the selflessness and solidarity of each and every one of our people.

The measures adopted by the United States Government on 20 August 1994 to intensify the conditions of the blockade and to place additional obstacles in the way of normal relations between the Cuban émigrés resident in that country and their relatives in the island of Cuba are now being fully enforced. Thus, Cuban nationals residing in the United States continue to be the only persons deprived of their right to enjoy normal relations with their country of origin.

As has been pointed out on more than one occasion, the strengthening of the policy of continued economic aggression against Cuba through political pressure and various threats against sovereign Governments, which is being implemented at both the legislative and the governmental levels, in the well-known circumstances facing my country, is no mere accident, and my country has now abruptly lost more than 85 per cent of its traditional trade.

Nor is it an accident that that policy is being taken to unheard-of extremes at a time when Cuba's major macroeconomic indicators are showing signs of recovery in the national economy and when changes being introduced are just beginning to yield positive results — including an increased interest in our country on the part of foreign investors.

During this year the international community has viewed with deep concern and alarm the approval by the United States Congress of legislative initiatives to move the economic, commercial and financial blockade against Cuba to unimaginable levels, particularly the new extraterritorial dimensions that the most conservative circles in the Congress want to give to a policy that, since its inception, has been designed to impose United States law on third States. To that end they intend to punish with imperial-like severity any State, company and even individual that has economic links with Cuba. Attempts to subject the sovereignty of third States to the designs of United States legislation and to subordinate the norms and principles of international law to the unilateral dictates of one country are becoming more evident and more dangerous than ever. Clearly this would be the ultimate consequence of the adoption of the initiatives that are currently before the United States Congress.

With a total lack of ethical and legal sense, those promoting these new initiatives are attempting to internationalize the unilateral blockade by the United States against Cuba, as if that policy had not already been expressly rejected by the international community in three General Assembly resolutions.

As indicated in the report of the Secretary-General, these new forms of extraterritorial application of United States laws could even lead to Cuban nationals, who have subsequently became American citizens and whose properties were nationalized by law in Cuba in the 1960s, taking legal action in United States courts against foreign investors in Cuba, which would obviously breach international law. Likewise, United States assistance to other countries would depend on the type of relation these may have with Cuba.

My Government cherishes the firm and constant hope of maintaining normal relations with all States, without exception, and our country reaffirms its readiness to settle the differences separating Cuba from the United States by means of dialogue and negotiation based on respect and equality, in the same way, for example, as the talks on migration. Despite that, there are new dangers facing Cuba and its survival as an independent nation. Cuba appeals to the international community not only because of the extraterritorial effects of the blockade, which have a juridical and economic affect on third States as well as us, but also because today, as never before, it is clear that the United States is attempting to decide, even through legal instruments, the system of government and social structures that should exist in Cuba, as was so starkly stated in the Torricelli Act and the bills before the United States Congress. In energetically rejecting such a presumption, Cuba, an independent and sovereign State, is not only acting in its own interest, but also for the benefit of all States which at any time may find themselves harassed by a more powerful country by virtue of the unfortunate precedent that could now be created. In Cuba, by the sovereign will of the Cuban people, there will be no second Platt Amendment.

These are, in essence, the reasons that underlie the draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.10 which I have the honour of introducing and which was already familiar to most of the delegations present here. The decision this body will soon have to take remains crucial to the respect of the principles enshrined in the Charter of this Organization and international law, and a clear message to those who attempt to violate them. We hope that with the positive vote of the delegations here present, the Assembly will once again reaffirm its commitment to the principles that govern the very existence of this Organization.

Mr. Tello (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This session has given Member States the opportunity to reaffirm their solemn commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In the recent Declaration adopted at the Special Commemorative Meeting on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of our Organization, we, the Member States, reaffirmed our support for the idea that:

> "the United Nations of the future will work with renewed vigour and effectiveness in promoting peace, development, equality and justice and understanding among the peoples of the world". (*resolution 50/6, fifth preambular paragraph*)

We also undertook to promote methods and means to secure peaceful settlement of conflicts.

In accordance with the foreign policy principles set out in its Constitution and pursuant to its obligations deriving from the United Nations and international law, the Government of Mexico has neither promulgated nor applies any laws of an extraterritorial nature. On the contrary, in a wide range of forums we have rejected unilateral coercive measure that affect the well-being of peoples, hamper free trade, and are alien to universally recognized commercial practices.

The Government of Mexico would like again to voice its concern at the recent adoption in the two houses of the United States Congress of draft legislation known as the "Cuban Liberty and Democracy Solidarity Act". My country respects the sovereignty of States but it is of the view that the provisions embodied in this legislation, by their nature and scope, compromise the sovereignty of third States and the principles of international law and free trade.

We appeal to the sense of justice, equity and international solidarity of the United States Congress to prevent that initiative from becoming law, because if it does come into force, it would amount to a clear breach of international law and a political precedent that would be unacceptable to the rest of the world.

The use of unilateral measures cannot lay any kind of basis for peaceful, secure and harmonious coexistence among States, but merely disturbs the climate for understanding and tolerance. Methods that belong to a bygone age and a clouded vision that is already out of step with the new world situation will not help us to strengthen the rules of a new international political scene. We are convinced that the embargo should be lifted. It is essential to realize that dialogue and negotiation have already proven their effectiveness and have yielded satisfactory results which should and can be built upon.

My delegation will of course vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.10 because it takes the view that pressure exerted by one country on another has never been and never will be the best way to secure an international order that respects the rule of law.

We reaffirm our conviction that dialogue, conciliation and negotiated political settlements are still fully relevant and valid as the best means of ensuring understanding.

Mr. Kittikhoun (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (*interpretation from French*): Here at its fiftieth session the General Assembly must once again take up the agenda item entitled "Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba". That embargo, which has gone on for more than 30 years now, has not only done damage to the Cuban economy but has above all prevented the Cuban economy from being reintegrated into the world economy.

My country, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, given our obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and international law, has never promulgated or applied laws or measures of this kind. We regard such measures as acts of aggression against the sovereignty of other States and against freedom of trade and navigation.

For four years now the Assembly has been seized of this issue. My delegation deeply regrets that no solution that is acceptable to the parties directly concerned is yet in sight. So, unfortunately, the embargo continues and is even reinforced. The Cuban people has already endured much suffering because of the embargo. Must the suffering continue? For how much longer? Should we just look on indifferently with our arms crossed? Obviously not. What, then, should we do to make a positive contribution to solving this thorny problem?

The Cuban people is a people like all the others on the Earth. They are innocent people who wish only to live in peace and dignity and to enjoy the economic and commercial cooperation of the outside world. We do not think it fair to punish a people, much less condemn it to further suffering and to living indefinitely with such an embargo. For these reasons, the international community must do everything in its power so that a solution agreed upon by the two parties can be found as quickly as possible, which would help to preserve peace and restore confidence between the peoples of this region and throughout the world.

No one here is unaware of the complexity of this problem, but if we all look straight ahead to the future, this problem, just like many other complex problems, stands a chance of being solved. The Lao People's Democratic Republic sincerely appeals to the two parties directly involved — the Republic of Cuba and the United States of America — to enter into serious negotiations and do everything in their power to solve this problem quickly.

The Acting President (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before calling on the next speaker, I should like to propose, if there are no objections, that the list of speakers in the debate on this agenda item be closed at 12 noon today.

It was so decided.

The Acting President (*interpretation from Spanish*): I therefore request representatives who wish to speak in the debate to add their names to the list of speakers as soon as possible.

Mr. Ngo Quang Xuan (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): This is the third time I have spoken to the Assembly on the agenda item entitled "Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba".

In this connection, I wish to refer to the statement made by Viet Nam's Minister for Foreign Affairs in which he said that international opinion is becoming increasingly concerned over the fact that the application of sanctions is veering more and more towards becoming a form of punishment or retribution used for specific political purposes, which is at odds with the relevant objectives originally set out in the Charter of the United Nations. In fact, such sanctions affect above all the lives and the health of innocent civilian populations. Hence, the prolongation of sanctions should be regarded as unacceptable because it neither makes them more effective nor takes into account their consequences.

The trend towards the use of dialogue and international and regional cooperation is becoming irreversible. We take the view that the principles of respect for independence and national sovereignty, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, mutually beneficial cooperation on a basis of equality, settlement of all disputes through negotiation and non-use or threat of use of force should always govern international relations.

On the basis of these principles, I wish to stress that Viet Nam fully associated itself with all the relevant General Assembly resolutions, such as resolutions 47/19, 48/16 and 49/9, as well as with the declarations recently adopted in Cartagena, Colombia, by the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries calling vigorously for the lifting of the economic, commercial and financial embargo against Cuba.

I wish to state once again Viet Nam's position that these laws with extraterritorial effects must be repealed because they are prejudicial to the legitimate trading interests not only of Cuba, but of third countries.

Viet Nam supports all endeavours and measures that can encourage the Republic of Cuba and the United States to undertake negotiations as soon as possible with a view to solving the outstanding problems between them, in keeping with the current trend towards dialogue and cooperation in the world.

In conclusion, I should like to extend the deep sympathy of the Vietnamese people to the people of Cuba, currently suffering so many hardships. In a spirit of understanding and of solidarity with the people of Cuba, the Government and people of Viet Nam have begun, and will continue, activities which lend moral and material assistance to and demonstrate solidarity with the Cuban people as they attempt to overcome the difficulties and the consequences of the blockade policy to which I have referred.

Mr. Londoño-Paredes (Colombia) *(interpretation from Spanish):* I have the honour of speaking on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has viewed with growing concern the continuation of the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba. We are naturally surprised to see that in some cases the effects of the end of the cold war seems to go in only one direction. Even more disturbing is the existence of discrimination for clearly political motives.

It is unacceptable to attempt to impose a certain form of conduct upon a State or group of States through unilateral coercion. In the case of the economic embargo against Cuba, such attempts, far from creating support within the international community, have stirred up more and more support for Cuba's Government and especially for its martyred people, for it is they who ultimately suffer the hardships caused by this action.

In various declarations the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has stated its support for the principles set forth in the resolutions adopted at the forty-seventh, forty-eighth and forty-ninth sessions of the General Assembly entitled "Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba".

At the Eleventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Cartagena de Indias, Colombia, from 18 to 20 October last, the Movement's position on this issue was reiterated. The Cartagena Declaration states,

> "The Heads of State or Government called upon the Government of the United States of America to put an end to the economic, commercial and financial measures and actions against Cuba, which, in addition to being unilateral and contrary to the United Nations Charter, international law and the principle of good neighbourliness, cause huge material losses and economic damage. They called upon the United States of America to settle its differences with Cuba through negotiations on a basis of equality and mutual respect and requested strict compliance with General Assembly resolutions 47/19, 48/16 and 49/9. They expressed deep concern regarding new bills submitted to the United States Congress that would step up the embargo against Cuba and widen its extraterritorial character."

Elsewhere in the Declaration,

> "The Heads of State or Government condemned the fact that certain countries, using their dominant position in the world economy, continue to step up the adoption of unilateral coercive measures against developing countries that are in clear contravention of international law, such as trade restrictions, blockades, embargoes and freezing of assets, with the purpose of preventing these countries from exercising their right to fully determine their own political, economic and social system and freely expand their international trade. They deemed such measures unacceptable and called for their immediate cessation."

The Heads of State or Government of the Ibero-American countries, which include various countries of the Movement, met recently in San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina, where they stated,

> "In accordance with the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, as well as those of the World Trade Organization and of international law, and also in accordance with resolutions of the General Assembly, we reject the unilateral coercive measures that affect the well-being of Ibero-America peoples, impede free exchange and universally accepted transparent trade practices and violate the principles governing regional coexistence and the sovereignty of States.
>
> "At this time we are particularly concerned over normative regulatory changes being discussed in the Congress of the United States that would run counter to these principles, application of which we demand."

Before concluding, in my capacity as Head of the delegation of Colombia, I should like to express our support for the draft resolution before us and our conviction that it is necessary to eliminate the unilateral application of economic and commercial measures against a State that affect the freedom to carry out international trade.

Once again, we appeal for dialogue and negotiation to be used to find a solution to the differences between the United States and Cuba.

Mr. Valle (Brazil): Since the end of the cold war, international relations have largely lost the confrontational and ideological character they once had. Global tendencies point to a need for increased dialogue and cooperation. Against this background, coercive trade measures of any kind are not appropriate. The international community is bound to condemn unilateral measures that have extraterritorial consequences and affect the legitimate interests of third parties. Brazil believes that the application by any country of laws and measures in violation of resolution 49/9 and previous resolutions on the matter, would be a cause of concern for the international community as a whole. Such laws and measures contradict generally accepted principles of international law. It is therefore appropriate for the General Assembly to take action on this issue.

Moreover, our assessment of the embargo against Cuba is that it only retards the accomplishment of its declared objective — that is, national reconciliation, the enjoyment of freedom and prosperity by the Cuban people and the full reintegration of Cuba into the inter-American community.

I take this opportunity to recall that such measures against Cuba were rejected very recently by several multilateral forums — most notably, the Rio Group, the Ibero-American summit and, as has just been mentioned by the Ambassador of Colombia, the Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

Brazil will vote in favour of draft resolution A/50/L.10 as a means of defending principles of international law, promoting peaceful and friendly relations between States and affirming the principles of cooperation. We expect that a large number of other countries will do the same.

Mr. Mwakawago (United Republic of Tanzania): Allow me to commend the Secretary-General on his report in document A/50/401 and A/50/401/Add.1, dated 20 September 1995 and 20 October 1995, respectively, in connection with agenda item 27, now before the General Assembly.

The implementation of resolution 49/9 of 26 October 1994, entitled "Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba", continues to attract widespread support among Member States.

Most notable is the fact that all the 48 replies from Governments, as well as six others, from organs and agencies of the United Nations system, recorded in the report affirm compliance with the resolution, in line with the purposes and principles of the Charter and international law. This is a clear indication that the international community is overwhelmingly opposed to the embargo against Cuba.

Therefore, my delegation remains gravely concerned that well after the adoption of resolutions 47/19, 48/16 and 49/9 no progress has been made to do away with measures

> "aimed at strengthening and extending the economic, commercial and financial embargo against Cuba" (*resolution 49/9, seventh preambular paragraph*).

This lack of progress has ominous implications for the lives of ordinary Cuban people.

In this year of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, the need to promote dialogue and to uphold the spirit and letter of the Charter could not be more urgent. Indeed, the post-cold-war spirit demands that nation States coexist in peace and mutual respect, under international law. Tanzania, like many other Member States, believes that the embargo imposed on Cuba, with its extraterritorial nature, does not augur well for international peace and security.

At this point, my delegation wishes to draw the Assembly's attention to the relevant section of the Final Declaration adopted by the Non-Aligned Movement at its Summit Conference held recently in Cartagena, Colombia. This calls for the lifting of the economic embargo against Cuba and urges the United States to settle its differences with Cuba through negotiations, on the basis of equality and mutual respect. Mindful of the adverse effects of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 — the "Torricelli Bill" — the leaders of the Non-Aligned

Movement also expressed deep concern about the new Helms-Burton legislation before the Congress of the United States, which seeks to intensify the embargo against Cuba and to widen its extraterritorial nature.

Tanzania, which enjoys very friendly relations with both the United States and Cuba, trusts that a negotiated solution will be possible before the devastating new legislation can take effect. Our belief is strengthened by the proven capacity of the United States, in particular, to broker peace in the Middle East and, now, in the Balkans. There is also the international climate conducive to peace efforts.

I shall conclude by expressing cautious optimism that this time next year the United States embargo against Cuba, which is more than 30 years old, will be on the negotiating table. It is with this in mind that Tanzania supports and will vote for draft resolution A/50/L.10.

Mr. Yoogalingam (Malaysia): We support the statement made by the representative of Colombia in his capacity as Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement. That statement duly reflects the traditional position taken by the leaders of the Non-Aligned Movement, which was reaffirmed at the Movement's Cartagena Summit.

We have always expressed the view, as reflected in our previous statements on this agenda item, that the matter can best be settled between the two countries themselves. Malaysia acknowledges Cuba's right of resort to the United Nations, particularly on issues involving the question of extraterritoriality. This issue impinges on the fundamental principles of international law and runs counter to a number of resolutions adopted over the years by this body. As we mark the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, it is timely for us to reiterate our commitment to those principles. They serve the collective interest of us all, and as Members of the United Nations we are all obliged to support them. Upholding the principles of international law and promoting peaceful and friendly relations between nations are the basic tenets that have governed inter-State relations. Consistent with these tenets, Malaysia will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Mr. Kharrazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): Just about a week ago, representatives of all States Members of the United Nations gathered here at the highest level to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Organization. In their statements, and by adopting the Declaration on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the United Nations, they not only emphasized the promotion of international cooperation and friendly relation among States, but also reaffirmed their strong commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law, particularly sovereign equality, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Despite the end of the cold war and the dawn of a new international environment, certain States regrettably continue to adopt unilateral measures and actions against other States. Specifically, coercive economic measures amounting to economic terrorism and based on the short-sighted interests of those who claim a predominant position in the world run absolutely contrary to the provisions of the Charter and the principles of international law embodied in various international instruments and documents, in particular the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Universal Declaration on the Eradication of Hunger and Malnutrition, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, and the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Such measures and actions adversely affect the social and economic development and the humanitarian activities of a target country and consequently hinder the full achievement of human rights by the people subjected to these measures.

It is an undeniable right of every State to choose its political, economic, social and cultural system without interference in any form by another State. In this context, the continuation of the economic, commercial and financial embargo against Cuba, which has inflicted serious losses and has resulted in economic hardship and deprivation for the Cuban people, runs contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter and the rules of international law. The Islamic Republic of Iran, like other members of the international community, advocates the removal and elimination of all economic and trade embargoes imposed on Cuba and believes that the differences between States should be settled in a peaceful manner. In this connection, the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, during its eleventh summit conference, held in Colombia two weeks ago, called upon the Government of the United States to put an end to its economic, commercial and financial measures and actions against Cuba.

Cognizant of the economic, social and financial difficulties which the Cuban nation is facing as a result of the unreasonable embargo, my delegation would like to extend its support once again to any step that the General Assembly may wish to take to resolve the issue under consideration. The international community should not remain silent about a situation in which certain States engage in economic terrorism and try actively to undermine the economic or political stability of another State with the aim of imposing a specific political and economic structure on that country.

Mr. Azwai (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The post-cold-war era has witnessed the settlement of many disputes. In many regions of the world, enemies have settled their differences and adversaries have buried the hatchet. This Assembly itself has sought, in its past three sessions, to solve the long-standing problem caused by the imposition by the United States of America of an economic, commercial and financial embargo against Cuba. While many had hoped that the United States would end its coercive measures against the Cuban people, quite the reverse has happened. Not only did the American Administration persist in its usual disregard of the provisions of the Assembly resolutions, including the latest, resolution 49/9, but it has tightened the embargo procedures by applying the set of measures adopted by it in August last year. This is not only a shameful flouting of the will of the majority of the international community but also an affirmation of the determination to persist in the attempt of imposing a political and social system of the United States' choosing on the Cuban people.

The net of anti-Cuba legislation which has been in the making for over 30 years now has hindered most of Cuba's efforts to promote its own economic and social development and has plunged a whole nation into suffering and hunger. I do not believe that the international community needs any figures or statistics to appreciate the magnitude of the damage done, especially in the case of the vulnerable groups of society such as children, the elderly and women, as a result of shortages of medicines, the ban on financial transfers and Cuba's inability to benefit from scientific and technological advances. These unethical practices which are flagrant violations of human rights refute America's claims that it is the defender of democracy, the upholder of international legality, the advocate of free trade and the champion of human rights. These practices push into the limelight the American approach of starving peoples and resorting to measures that have an extraterritorial reach and constrain the freedom of trade by pressuring companies and other countries to prevent them from dealing with the peoples who reject United States hegemony, such as the Cuban people.

The policy pursued by the United States of America against Cuba is not an isolated case. Rather, it is a well-established policy that has been pursued against other countries, including my own. Since 1986, the American Administration has imposed against my country harsh economic measures that have continued to be renewed twice yearly. These include banning American companies from dealing with Libya, preventing Libyan students from continuing their post-graduate education at American universities, and freezing Libyan assets in American banks. As in the case of Cuba, where the American Administration justifies its embargo with pretexts that can only be construed as interference in the internal affairs of Cuba, the pretext used to justify its series of coercive measures against Libya is that Libya poses a threat to United States national security. If one is surprised at America's actions against the Cuban people, just because they decided, of their own free will, to choose their own political and economic system, nobody would be naive enough to believe the claim that Libya poses any threat whatever to America's national security. How could a small country with limited resources such as Libya be a source of threat to anybody, let alone being a threat to the security of the strongest country in the world, the United States of America, which is located thousands of kilometres away from Libya?

The situation, in fact, is quite the reverse. It is Libya that has been the target of continuous American threats and provocations. Libya's security and the safety of its people have been compromised by direct aggression, when hundreds of American military aircraft carried out raids against Libyan cities, demolishing houses, schools, hospitals — leaving behind tens of dead, including women and children. When such acts of aggression and provocation failed to achieve the United States objectives against the Libyan people, the United States created a new problem which has come to be known as the Lockerbie incident. The United States accused two Libyan nationals of being the perpetrators and, instead of accepting Libya's initiatives and the proposals of regional organizations which aim at resolving the problem in the framework of the competent forums, under the relevant conventions, including the 1971 Montreal Convention on the safety of civil aviation, the United States of America has rejected all such offers and has used the United Nations Security Council to impose unjust sanctions on Libya, which have resulted in the death and injury of thousands of people because of the intensive use of land roads and have caused economic losses in excess of $10 billion.

My delegation, which fully realizes the magnitude of the difficulties that face the Cuban nation as a result of the American embargo, wishes to express its support for any measures the General Assembly may see fit to adopt with a view to seeking an end to this embargo. In this context, it is most important to recall that the principle of the settlement of disputes between States by peaceful means is enshrined in many articles of the United Nations Charter, including Article 2, subparagraph 3, which reads "All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means ...". This principle, which has been reaffirmed since the establishment of the United Nations, has proved its effectiveness in the settlement of many disputes. That is why my delegation hopes that the accumulated residue of the past will not stand in the way of resorting to this principle in seeking to end the long-standing embargo against Cuba, especially since Cuba has repeatedly declared its readiness to resolve the problem within that framework, and has voiced its readiness to seek the settlement of the problem by the appropriate means.

The choice now is the United States'. Either it responds to repeated calls and settles its differences with Cuba and with other countries on this basis, and thereby pursues a course that would be welcomed by the international community as something that meets one of the purposes of the United Nations contained in subparagraph 1 of Article 33 of the Charter, which calls on the parties to any dispute to seek a solution by peaceful means, or it will persist in pursuing the policy of embargoes and boycotts, and thereby make itself the subject of continued international protests, since such coercive measures run counter to the aims and purposes of the United Nations, especially with regard to the promotion of friendly relations amongst peoples.

Such a policy also contradicts the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-ninth session. This Charter states in its article 32 that no State shall use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other measures to pressure any other State into becoming dependent on it in the exercise of its sovereign rights. Moreover, the coercive measures imposed by the United States against Cuba and other countries impede efforts aimed at strengthening the foundations of constructive international cooperation, and are not consistent with the tendency towards the establishment of relations of friendship and cooperation that would strengthen international peace and security. To persist in imposing these measures is to undermine the spirit of trust, and to create a climate of uncertainty for all peoples.

Let the Administration of the United States know that the policy of embargo, starvation and the killing of the elderly and the children will not succeed in subjugating peoples. It is an unjust imperialistic policy of the arrogance of power that has been rejected by all peoples. The Cuban people are the witness to that fact. We salute the Cuban people and every other people that suffers injustice at the hands of the United States, refuses to knuckle under to the arrogance of power and resists the embargo, for it will prevail.

Mr. Poernomo (Indonesia): My delegation views with deepening concern the dispute between Cuba and the United States, which has persisted for the past three and a half decades. It is particularly regrettable that the poor relations between them have been aggravated by the imposition of numerous measures, including a devastating embargo on trade. Further compounding the situation is new legislation intended to further tighten the embargo to the detriment of the interests of the Cuban people. Consequently, Cuba may well face an economic crisis of unprecedented proportions.

Before proceeding, I would like to associate myself with the statement just delivered by the Permanent Representative of Colombia, as Chairman of the group of non-aligned States.

Punitive economic action of such magnitude, and for so long, has already inflicted great suffering and hardship on the people of Cuba and has impeded their development aspirations. The strengthening of international cooperation for development has now become essential; hence, we share the widely expressed view that, in the post-cold-war era, no nation should be deprived of the opportunity to participate freely and without hindrance in the economic, commercial and financial relations between States. To erect barriers in this regard is incompatible with the objective of establishing a new and more equitable international order for stable peace and for economic and social justice.

Continuation of the embargo may well provoke a serious crisis, not only for Cuba but also beyond, with repercussions for regional peace and stability. It is against this backdrop that various international forums, such as the Non-Aligned Movement and the Ibero-American Heads of State and Government, have called for an end to unilaterally imposed coercive measures directed against other States. Many Member States have also expressed their opposition to the promulgation of laws with extraterritorial effects that thereby adversely impact the interests of other countries.

Cuban-American relations call for a new and refreshing approach taking into account the profound transformation that has taken place on the global scene — including in the Latin American region — where we have witnessed an end to conflict and a strengthening of political, economic and social relationships.

The reintegration of Cuba into regional and international economic life has now become imperative. It would also be in conformity with the sovereignty of nations, the United Nations Charter and the principles of international law. At this juncture, we cannot turn away from those precepts and norms.

Mr. Mazemo (Zimbabwe): My delegation associates itself fully with the statement by the Permanent Representative of Colombia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

As we have all said on numerous occasions here before this Assembly, and at other international forums, the end of the cold war opened a window of opportunity for the solution of seemingly intractable international problems. Indeed, many old enmities have disappeared beyond recognition and in their place we have witnessed cooperation, dialogue and reconciliation: former adversaries, who once stood on opposite sides of the ideological divide around the world, have come together to resolve their differences through negotiations and dialogue, as called for in the Charter of the United Nations. We do not believe that the continued crisis between the United States and Cuba has a place in this emerging world order, whose important, integral qualities and cardinal principles should, we hope, be peaceful coexistence and tolerance in a politically, socially and economically diverse world system.

Zimbabwe is deeply concerned at the recently proposed measures to tighten even further the economic, commercial and financial embargo against Cuba. These latest measures aimed at reinforcing the economic strangulation of Cuba curiously — and regrettably — come at a time when the strength of criticism by world public opinion has made this policy increasingly untenable and insupportable. We have made this point in the past and we do so again now: the extraterritorial extension of United States legislation is inconsistent with international law; it violates basic and long-standing rules of international law; and it violates the sovereignty both of Cuba and of its trading partners.

We believe that it is both wrong and immoral for the more powerful Members of the Organization to impose their will on their smaller and weaker neighbours. We have been told on many occasions that the intention of the embargo is to induce a certain social order in Cuba. My delegation is not convinced that this is a judicious way to encourage economic and political reforms: the only effective way of introducing reform is through dialogue and active engagement, and not through isolation, disengagement and embargoes.

The United States has in the past argued that every government has a right to choose the partners with which it wishes to have commercial and political relations. However, we think that, when unilaterally conceived measures negatively impact on the right of other States to engage freely in international trade, then the international community has a right and an obligation to demand a reversal of such measures.

The Charter of the United Nations provides a mechanism for determining the existence of — and the responses to — threats to international peace and security. Under Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter, only the Security Council, after collectively determining the existence of a threat to international peace and security, is empowered by the international community to impose legally binding economic sanctions. In the situation before us today, the existence of a threat to international peace and security has not been collectively determined, and the embargo is therefore a clear violation of international law and of the relevant provisions of the Charter.

The embargo has, over the years, caused untold human suffering to the Cuban people. Cuba's remarkable progress in the areas of public health, education and social welfare, which was matched only in the world's richest countries and used to be the envy of people all around the world, has been crippled by the trade embargo, which effectively prevents Cuba from importing medicines, foodstuffs and other essential commodities. Zimbabwe is in no way convinced of the rightness of the ethics of a policy that denies the free flow of food and medicine to the most vulnerable sectors of the Cuban population: young children, poor women, the elderly and the sick.

The brutally harsh realities that have been visited upon the Cuban people by the blunt instrument of the embargo should be of concern to all Members of the Organization. The ugly scars of this policy stand out in sharp relief as the sad evidence of the collapse of an economy and a social welfare system that once ranked among the best in the world. However, my delegation is convinced that, as they have gallantly done for the past generation, the Cuban people will triumph and justice will prevail.

Zimbabwe believes that the United States, as the world's strongest Power, should lead by example. We indeed take note that the United States is currently playing a crucial mediatory and facilitatory role in significant peace processes elsewhere. We dearly cherish the excellent relations that we enjoy with both the United States and Cuba, and we are very uncomfortable with occasions such as this, when we seem to chastise one of our friends.

What we seek, in so many words, is dialogue and reconciliation, and not confrontation. We therefore sincerely hope that the United States will reconsider its policies, resolve all outstanding differences and put the matter finally to rest.

Mr. Odlum (Saint Lucia): The countries which comprise the Caribbean basin at present enjoy a wide measure of mutual agreement and solidarity on the concerns and issues affecting each other. The recent establishment of the Association of Caribbean States has given fresh impetus to this flowering consensus, and Cuba is a member of that Association.

The Government of Saint Lucia is pleased to support the draft resolution entitled "Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba".

The history of the debate of the issue of the United States embargo against Cuba appears to be nothing but a dialogue of the deaf. It is a dialogue of the deaf because this Assembly has debated resolutions of this same genre for the past three years. The majority voice has strengthened on every occasion as the General Assembly adopted the parent resolution, 47/19, with 59 votes in favour in 1992. In the following year General Assembly resolution 48/16 was adopted with 88 votes in favour, and in 1994 the General Assembly voted convincingly to end the embargo by 101 votes to 2, with 48 abstentions. Two cold-war allies stood firmly against the general will of the Assembly.

Subsequent action by the organizers of the blockade in tightening it instead of deferring to the spirit and intention of the resolutions of the Assembly constitutes a flagrant act of disrespect for the principles and organs of the United Nations. On 21 September this year, the House of Representatives of the United States Congress adopted, by a two-thirds majority, a new law containing specific provisions which exceed the Torricelli Act of 1992 in increasing the severity of the economic blockade.

Saint Lucia is deeply concerned that a founding member of this Assembly, which also enjoys the distinction of being the host country to the United Nations, should so trivialize the conclusions of the General Assembly and seek to flout the will and the expressed wish of the international community. The clear intention of the Helms-Burton bill is to penalize third States which maintain economic and commercial relations with Cuba and to use the force of the law of the United States to impose sanctions against persons, companies and countries seeking to conduct trading and commercial relations with Cuba.

The extraterritorial nature of this legislation is offensive to small countries like ours and seriously undermines fundamental notions of sovereignty and equality which constitute the pillars of the Charter of the United Nations. The expressions of good intentions to preserve the spirit of the Charter which we heard consistently throughout the debate at the Special Commemorative Meeting of the Assembly should strengthen the resolve of Member States not to place in jeopardy the fundamental tenets of our much-revered institution.

The Foreign Ministers of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) States and their representatives met at a special meeting in New York last month and discussed the question of the United States embargo against Cuba in the light of the new Helms-Burton legislation. There was strict unanimity on the undesirability of the new provisions and a concerted decision to renew the call for an end to the Cuban blockade. Saint Lucia has repeatedly discussed with our Cuban colleagues concerns about questions relating to human rights and democracy in Cuba; we are convinced that there is a strong mood for change and reform in Cuba and the impact of the economic blockade might well be counter-productive in slowing down the process of economic liberalization rather than accelerating it.

Unbiased observers of the Cuban economy must note a tremendous swing of the pendulum in the direction of liberalized trading and fiscal and monetary reform in the Cuba of the nineties, as opposed to the Cuba of the sixties. In the sixties, foreign commerce in Cuba was centralized in 20 companies. Today, 225 Cuban companies and 595 authorized representatives of foreign firms are engaged in commercial operations. The original concentration of land and cooperatives in large State agricultural companies averaging 12,000 hectares each has given way to 4000 cooperatives with an average size of 1000 hectares each. Private markets have also been established for the sale of agricultural products. In the employment sector self-employment, which was previously eliminated in the sixties, has been re-established and there is now a healthy small trading sector in Cuba which is further stimulated by the relaxation of foreign currency restrictions.

Adversity sometimes brings its share of positive benefits and the Cuban economy has been seriously challenged in terms of down-sizing and structural change. There has been a serious dismantling of unwieldy State apparatus and a welcome reduction in the number of personnel and functions of State organizations which a number of United Nations Member States, and even the United Nations itself, might envy. In 1992 the Cuban Parliament approved a constitutional amendment which modified existing laws in respect of the Cuban State's acknowledgement of property rights, the rights of joint ventures, and economic associations with foreign capital investments. This freeing-up of joint-venture activity is one of the effective routes to Latin American and Caribbean integration resulting in the signing of 50 joint ventures with Mexican, Argentinean, Venezuelan, Chilean and Caribbean companies.

This is clearly not the time to alienate and isolate. This is a time to embrace and consolidate. My delegation to the fiftieth anniversary Special Commemorative Meeting of the Assembly was disappointed when a certain delegation vacated its seat whenever a country which it perceived to be its enemy took to the podium. This protest action inside the very sanctuary of free speech is a clear violation of the spirit of San Francisco. The entire *raison d'être* of the United Nations is threatened when countries which disagree refuse to listen to each other.

In the same vein, Saint Lucia makes a special plea for the adoption of draft resolution A/50/L.10, in deference to the cumulative wish of the international community that this attack on the impoverished women and children of Cuba should stop and the courage and creativity of the Cuban people be allowed to blossom and bear the fruit of total assimilation into the international community.

Mr. Surie (India): I will be very brief. Consistent with the position of my Government on this issue, my delegation supports the draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.10. The position of my Government is in conformity with the established position of the Non-Aligned Movement, wherein the Movement has called *inter alia* upon the United States of America to settle all its differences with Cuba through negotiations on the basis of equality and mutual respect. We believe that there is great merit in this approach.

Mr. Jele (South Africa): My delegation is pleased to have this opportunity to express its views on the necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo by the United States of America against Cuba. My delegation speaks on behalf of the ordinary people of South Africa when we record that we are deeply indebted to the Government and people of Cuba for the selfless contribution they made to the anti-colonial and anti-apartheid struggle in southern Africa. It is therefore not surprising that in recent months a number of prominent South African corporations have joined European and other companies in fostering trade and industrial joint ventures with Cuba.

The economic embargo against Cuba is a product of the cold war. Innocent civilians have suffered, and continue to suffer, immensely as a result of this policy. My delegation rejects the notion that the people of Cuba should be starved into ideological submission.

In this new post-cold-war era, highlighted by a recent re-commitment to the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, Member States should encourage and promote policies of free and unhindered engagement in the global economy. We are particularly concerned that additional measures, which will expand the extraterritorial scope of the embargo, are being considered. These measures will have the counter-productive effect of infringing on the sovereignty of other States and the legitimate interests of their nationals.

It is our fervent hope that a process of open and constructive dialogue between the relevant parties will result in this item being removed from the agenda of the General Assembly in the near future. My delegation therefore expresses support for the resolution before us.

Ms. Durrant (Jamaica): The item before us, "Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba", has been discussed at all sessions of the General Assembly since 1991. In those sessions, Jamaica, through its votes, expressed its views on resolutions similar to draft resolution A/50/L.10 now before us.

Jamaica's national policy of peaceful engagement has followed a different course to the one advocated in the embargo. We, of course, believe our way to be the correct one if Cuba is to be peacefully reintegrated into the community of nations of the Americas. All evidence indicates that this process is under way, and we are encouraged by the extent of the progress that has so far been achieved. We therefore reiterate our concern, previously expressed in this very Hall and on other occasions, at any initiative that would further complicate regional trading arrangements through national legislation which has an overwhelming extraterritorial character.

It is our hope that, in the very near future, the parties most directly involved will find an amicable solution to the problem which draft resolution A/50/L.10 seeks to address. National development, bilateral relations and, indeed, the very far reaching initiatives now under way in the Americas will then not be inhibited by the constraints imposed by such an embargo. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of draft resolution A/50/L.10.

Mr. Marrero (United States of America): The United States deeply regrets that the General Assembly is again considering a resolution on the United States economic embargo of Cuba. My Government has consistently taken the position that this embargo is a bilateral issue not properly considered by this body, and that the United States, like other nations, has the sovereign right to determine its bilateral trading relationships. Nevertheless, my Government recognizes that many countries disagree with this aspect of United States policy towards Cuba. We are confident, however, that the delegations supporting this resolution share the objective of United States policy towards Cuba — a peaceful transition to a democratic system in which human rights are fully observed.

This policy of my Government towards Cuba has evolved considerably since the General Assembly last considered this question. The United States, responding to a wave of dangerous and uncontrolled migration between Cuba and the United States, and to the mutual desire of both countries to regularize migration relations, reached accords on migration which provide for legal migration to the United States of at least 20,000 Cuban citizens per year. In addition, Cubans seeking to enter the United States illegally are no longer automatically allowed to do so, but are returned to Cuba. In another significant step, my Government announced on 6 October of this year a series of important measures aimed at fostering increased contacts and heightened communication with the Cuban people. These measures include the authorization of the reciprocal establishment of news bureaux, greatly increased academic, cultural and scientific exchanges, and facilitation of emergency family visitation. They should contribute to the development of that civil society so noticeably lacking in Cuba, which in turn could provide a basis for the peaceful transition to democracy we believe the international community desires.

In other, related developments, the United States Government has licensed, since 1992, over $100 million worth of private humanitarian donations from the American people and United States non-governmental organizations to the Cuban people, making the people of the United States the Cuban people's largest donor during this period. Direct telephone communications between our two countries have been dramatically improved, facilitating better communication between our two peoples. Finally, the Government of the United States has indicated repeatedly over the past year that it is not wedded to indefinite continuation of the embargo, but is prepared to reduce its sanctions in carefully calibrated ways should there be significant political and economic reform in Cuba.

These are positive, constructive developments in United States policy toward Cuba, steps in a direction we believe the international community welcomes. They are not, however, reflected in this draft resolution. At the same time, there has been little, if any, progress in Cuba that would justify increased international support for the position of the Cuban Government. The human rights situation in that country, which has been rightly condemned by this body at each of the last several sessions of the General Assembly, remains deplorable. There are no indications from the Government that a political opening is being considered. To the contrary, the leader of the Cuban regime made clear, during his recent attendance at the commemorative meeting on the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, the intention of his Government to maintain the repressive status quo. Such economic measures as have been introduced have been carefully designed to preserve the Government's control over the population and to avoid any commitment to thoroughgoing economic reform, let alone any movement towards free elections.

The Cuban Government seeks to convince many Member States that the United States embargo is the cause of all of Cuba's problems, economic and otherwise. Dispassionate analysis, however, reveals that the real cause of these problems lies with the Government's misguided economic policies and the suppression of private initiative. What is lacking in this unbalanced draft resolution is any mention of the context of United States policy, which is the urgent need for meaningful political and economic change of the island. It has been the hope of many nations that such change could come about merely by virtue of increased contact between Cuba and the international community, without pressure of the kind supplied by our economic embargo. Sadly, the hopes of these nations have not been realized. We have therefore concluded that, unpopular as our economic sanctions may be in this body, their continued application is necessary.

The United States recognizes that the people of Cuba must decide their own destiny. We have no hostile intent towards them. Rather, we wish to help, not only by reaching out directly to them through the measures I have outlined but also by continued pressure on the Cuban Government to effect long-overdue changes. We want, as we know most of the other Members of the United Nations want, to give the Cuban people hope for a better future. In this sense, the United States embargo stands as a symbol of our faith, together with the faith of the Cuban people, that the trampling of their basic rights and freedoms has not been forgotten.

For these reasons, the United States cannot vote in favor of the draft introduced under agenda item 27.

The Acting President (*interpretation from Spanish*): Having heard the last speaker in the debate on this item, we shall proceed to consider draft resolution A/50/L.10.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting. May I first remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Ms. Yang Yanyi (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): In its resolutions 47/19, 48/16 and 49/9, the General Assembly reiterated such principles as equality of national sovereignty, non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of another country, and the international freedoms of navigation and trade, and called on all countries to fulfil their commitments and obligations under the United Nations Charter and to abide by these principles and by international law. This reflects the just aspirations of the international community.

The cold war is over, but it does not follow that its results will disappear of their own accord. The economic, commercial and financial embargo against Cuba by a certain country, which has lasted for more than three decades, is a classic example. The embargo has caused enormous difficulties for Cuba's economy and great suffering for the Cuban people. It has also gravely impeded Cuba's attempts at opening up and at reform and has hampered its normal economic and trade relations with third countries. The international community cannot but continue to express its utmost regret and grave concern over this.

The Chinese Government has consistently held that all countries have the right to choose their own social systems, ideologies and roads to development in the light of their respective national conditions, which cannot be infringed upon by any other countries. To impose an embargo or blockade or to resort to power politics in any other form runs counter to the principles of international law and the basic norms governing relations between States.

We strongly appeal to the country concerned to go along with the trend of the times and — in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the norms of international law and the relevant General Assembly resolutions — immediately to repeal its laws and measures aimed at blockading Cuba's economy, commerce and finance. We urge it to enter into negotiation and dialogue with Cuba on the basis of equality and respect for Cuba's independence and sovereignty, so that the Cuban people, free from external interference, can revitalize their economy and social development and enhance their economic and trade contacts and cooperation with other countries.

In view of these considerations, the Chinese delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/50/L.10.

Mr. Yáñez-Barnuevo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I am speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.10.

The European Union strongly favours a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba. We are concerned about the negative effects of the embargo on the situation of the Cuban population. However, this is not the only reason for the difficult situation in Cuba. Because of its economic and political choices, the Cuban Government is also responsible for the deterioration of the situation in the country.

The European Union condemns the repeated violations of human rights in Cuba, particularly in the political sphere. The European Union considers it supremely important to scrupulously respect human rights and fundamental freedoms in Cuba and to deepen the institutional and economic reforms in the country.

The Cuban Government has embarked on a process of economic reform that we hope will enable the country to overcome the present economic crisis and pave the way towards a more comprehensive plan to move to a market economy. In the political sphere, the Cuban regime retains a firm monopoly on political power. Additional efforts to promote dialogue and cooperation at all levels are required to make possible the necessary evolution towards democracy and pluralism, as in other parts of Latin America. In this context, the European Union believes that stepping up contacts is the best way to give impetus to the transition to a democratic system. The European Union has decided to enter into a political dialogue with Cuba in order to identify the most appropriate framework for future relations between the Union and Cuba for promoting the acceleration of the internal reform process.

The European Union's opposition to the extraterritorial application of restrictive domestic legislation is well known. Accordingly, we have always rejected the United States actions intended to involve third States in the application of commercial measures that fall exclusively within the scope of the foreign or security policies of the United States. We have therefore opposed legislative initiatives designed to tighten even more the unilateral commercial embargo against Cuba by the extraterritorial enforcement of United States domestic law, in particular through extraterritorial provisions designed to discourage companies from third countries from maintaining trade relations with Cuba. We believe that such measures violate the general principles of international law and the sovereignty of independent States. The European Union therefore takes a negative view of the passing by both Houses of the United States Congress of their respective versions of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act and reiterates its opposition to the adoption of any measure of extraterritorial scope or in contravention of international norms, in particular those of the World Trade Organization.

The European Union cannot accept the United States unilaterally determining or restricting the European Union's economic and commercial relations with any State.

The European Union believes that the United States commercial embargo against Cuba is primarily a matter that has to be resolved bilaterally between the Governments of the United States and of Cuba. The States members of the European Union will have these concerns in mind when voting on the draft resolution before us.

Mr. Chulkov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Russian Federation will vote in favour of the draft resolution on the necessity of ending the economic blockade of Cuba because, as a matter of principle, we cannot accept attempts by States to extend their domestic jurisdiction beyond the borders of their own territory. In our opinion, such actions are a violation of existing international legal norms and are damaging to third countries.

The Russian Federation believes that attempts to strangle Cuba economically by means of an embargo are counterproductive and likely only to exacerbate the economic situation of most of that country's people. Moreover, such efforts could also retard democratic changes and economic reforms already under way in Cuba. In this connection, the attempt to legislate further measures to tighten the economic blockade against Cuba and to give international scope to such measures is very disturbing to us — as, indeed, it is to many other countries. Here, we make specific reference to the well-known Helms-Burton Bill, called the "Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995". It is our belief that the lifting of the economic, trade and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba and a general easing of tensions in Cuban-American relations would in fact help to move Cuban society forward towards further democratization and greater openness.

The Russian delegation believes that mutually acceptable settlements in the whole range of issues in Cuban-American relations with a view to their normalization should be sought primarily through constructive bilateral dialogue and a broadening of the negotiating process between the two countries. In this connection we view certain measures recently taken by the United States Administration as very timely and useful. Those measures include the reduction of restrictions on travel to Cuba, the provision of humanitarian assistance, and increased cultural and information exchanges.

Russia, for its part, has always been guided by the principles of the sovereign equality of States, non-intervention in their internal affairs and freedom of international trade and navigation — points mentioned in the draft resolution before us today. Russia continues to develop and maintain normal trade and economic relations with Cuba on the basis of the principles of common benefit and mutual advantage. We have trade ties with Cuba that are strictly in accordance with generally accepted international norms, without any type of discrimination whatsoever, and we use world prices.

At the same time, we would emphasize that our policy on lifting the economic blockade against Cuba does not in any way imply any change in our position of principle on the issue of respect for human rights in that country.

Mr. Izquierdo (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Ecuador will vote in favour of the draft resolution on the necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba because of Ecuador's opposition to discriminatory unilateral economic practices that go against the principles of free trade and circulation of goods, darken the atmosphere of international relations, impede the peaceful resolution of differences between States, hamper the economic and social integration of peoples and harm innocent civilian populations.

Allow me to recall that in the Final Declaration of the Ninth Meeting of Heads of State and Government of the Rio Group, held in Quito on 4 and 5 September of this year, our leaders expressed their concern

> "at attempts to enforce domestic laws beyond territorial boundaries in violation of international law and the fundamental principles governing coexistence in the region. Such actions violate the sovereignty of other States and are contrary to unanimously accepted transparent trade practices". *(A/50/425, para. 13)*

Lastly, my delegation wishes to say, as it did at the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly, that Ecuador has never established any legal or political measure that might impede relations with Cuba, as it has communicated officially to the United Nations Secretariat.

Mr. Lamptey (Ghana): Ghana will vote in favour of the draft resolution before us, as it has in the past, on the draft resolution on this item, and as it will in the future should this item still come before the Assembly.

Whatever the circumstances, whatever the fears that form the basis of the institution of an embargo against Cuba by the United States more than 30 years ago, the world has undergone tremendous changes today. Cuba itself has changed. I have listened carefully to the statement of the representative of the United States. We do not share these views. Whatever the analysis, it is the will of the Cuban people that should determine the order of that society. The suffering of the Cuban people must be brought to an end. Even if one accepts the thesis that the Cuban Government contributes to the hardship of its own people, the fact remains that without the embargo things would have been easier on the people of Cuba.

We appeal to the United States to bow to the will of the international community, to listen to the voices of its own allies and its neighbours and lift the embargo on Cuba so that the people of the martyred nation that is Cuba can have peace to make progress in social and economic development.

The Acting President (*interpretation from Spanish*): We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/50/L.10.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Dominica, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kazakstan, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic

Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, United States of America, Uzbekistan

Abstaining:

Albania, Armenia, Bhutan, Czech Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Guatemala, Hungary, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Morocco, Netherlands, Niger, Oman, Palau, Poland, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Swaziland, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/50/L.10 was adopted by 117 votes to 3, with 38 abstentions (resolution 50/10).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Kuwait advised the Secretariat that it intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President (*interpretation from Spanish*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Cárdenas (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In previous years, the delegation of Argentina abstained in votes on draft resolutions similar to that just adopted by the Assembly because it understood that the content created problems of a bilateral nature, between two Member States with which we have deep relations of friendship.

Nevertheless, the measures referred to in the resolution seem not to have had what was certainly the desired effect. Furthermore, the starting-point of any sanctions should be their application for a reasonable and limited amount of time, depending on each individual case.

We would like to point out that Cuba is introducing a series of major reforms in the economic sphere. These are designed to increase openness and a degree of freedom in its economy. Hence, these measures should not be discouraged. The Government of Argentina trusts that the Government of Cuba will broaden these reforms. Furthermore, it hopes that Cuba will gradually extend these reforms to the political and human rights spheres. We attach fundamental importance to human rights. Thus, values that are essential to the peoples of the continent will be affirmed — that is, democracy, respect for human rights and the fundamental freedoms of the human being.

For those reasons, my delegation voted in favour of the resolution just adopted, although we would like to make it specifically clear that we will continue to press for the need for greater democratic reform in Cuba.

Mr. Fukushima (Japan): I have asked to speak in order to explain, for the record, Japan's position in abstaining in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.10.

Japan continues to have the doubts it has indicated in the past three years, as to whether a discussion at the General Assembly may actually be conducive to resolving, in a constructive way, the question of the United States embargo against Cuba.

This question is very complex in nature. Japan wonders if the resolution that has just been adopted can in fact properly address the question in all its complexity. If it cannot, the question will remain unsettled until a better way is found to achieve an appropriate solution.

Mr. Vivas (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In recent years, the international community has, through dialogue and direct negotiation, made significant progress with regard to economic and trading cooperation. It has also taken major steps towards universal peace and democracy and solidarity.

Any discriminatory trading practice, any imposition of unilateral economic measures or extraterritorial application of domestic laws hampers this process and is unacceptable and incompatible with the standards of international law and the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

It is impossible to conceive of a just social and economic international order in which one State imposes commercial, economic and financial restrictions on another. It is unacceptable to seek solutions to bilateral political differences through military or economic coercion or through any other kind of pressure that infringes on the sovereignty and independence of nations and has a detrimental effect on the well-being of peoples.

The adoption of measures of this kind in no way contributes to the resolution of differences. Quite the contrary, it provokes unnecessary confrontations that affect the population without changing the regime against which they are imposed. My Government rejects this type of measure and considers that the embargo against Cuba should end.

On the basis of these considerations, we decided to vote in favour of the resolution. This, however, should not be interpreted as an expression of support by the Government of Venezuela for any particular political regime. We believe that the arguments presented against the embargo are valid, regardless of a particular country's political situation. The promotion of democracy, which for us is fundamental, should not be mixed up with coercive unilateral measures of indefinite duration. The result of the voting confirms our collective desire to condemn any unilateral act of aggression against the integrity of any nation or its right to self-determination.

Mrs. Teo-Jacob (Singapore): This year Singapore changed its vote on the resolution on this issue from one of abstention to one of support. In doing so, we take no position on the specific bilateral problems leading to the imposition of the embargo against Cuba many years ago. This is a matter for the two countries to settle bilaterally.

However, our view is that international relations have evolved to the point where the principle of free trade should be the primary consideration for the international community. Our view is that sanctions should be used only in extremely serious cases, and then only upon the authority of the Security Council. The unilateral imposition of sanctions with extraterritorial applications is a dangerous trend that will distort free trade, to the ultimate detriment of the entire international community. All nations should be able to trade freely and openly with any other nation, regardless of political views. Openness and engagement are the best ways to build a true community of nations.

Mr. Malik (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of Iraq regrets being unable to vote on the draft resolution just adopted because of the conditions of the embargo imposed upon it, which deprive Iraq of the right to vote. Had we had the opportunity, we would have voted in favour of the resolution.

The embargo imposed against the Cuban people is a flagrant violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, since it aims at achieving political objectives which have nothing to do with international peace and security. Furthermore, the embargo runs counter to the most basic of human and moral values. Iraq calls for an end to such practices whose aim is to strip peoples of their right to life, freedom and dignity and to deprive nations of the opportunity to achieve social and economic development.

Mr. Fowler (Canada): Canada once again supported the resolution on this issue. Canada has followed its own policy on Cuba, believing that engagement rather than isolation is the best means of encouraging reform in Cuba. Canada's primary concern with respect to the embargo remains its intended extraterritorial reach — the way in which the laws and regulations governing the embargo seek to constrain the freedom of trade of third countries such as Canada.

Canada has always taken a vigorous stand against these and similar measures. At the same time, the embargo cannot be blamed for all of Cuba's problems. In our view, economic and political reform in Cuba is needed for Cuba to overcome its current difficulties and achieve its potential.

In addition, I would like to mention our continuing concerns over the state of human rights and democratic development in Cuba, which fall short of internationally accepted standards. We will continue, both bilaterally and in the forums offered by the United Nations, to press for improvement in these areas.

Mr. Jallow (Gambia): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.10, which asserts some of the cherished principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, because it serves as a relevant reminder of the importance of the status quo of sovereign equality and interdependence of States, particularly States Members of the United Nations.

The continued imposition of the commercial and financial embargo by the United States of America against Cuba contradicts the spirit and letter of the guiding principles on which our Organization is founded. The Gambia joined other countries in voting in favour of lifting the embargo because the embargo runs counter to principles of international cooperation and development.

Justification for continuing the embargo has been dimmed by three decades of development in social, economic and human rights areas, as well as in international relations, both in Cuba and globally. Cuba and Cubans remain in control not only of their destiny but also of the socio-economic welfare of Cubans. In spite of the hardships imposed by the embargo, Cuba continues to develop at a progressive rate, even assuming a major international role in medicine and genetic engineering. In addition, Cuba continues to enjoy a period of stability and consistent development, which is critical to the welfare of its people.

It is for these reasons that the Gambia decided this year to vote in favour of the resolution just adopted.

The Acting President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote after the vote.

May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 27?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 156 *(continued)*

Multilingualism

(a) Draft resolution (A/50/L.6/Rev.1)

(b) Amendments (A/50/L.8 and A/50/L.9)

Mr. Butler (Australia): My delegation has given very considerable thought to the issues addressed in draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1. Let me say immediately that this is an important subject. It is an important subject to the United Nations. It is an important subject to Australia.

Under those circumstances we have shared the view of the many who have thought that this draft resolution would be best adopted by consensus. We doubt that there has been a sufficient amount and quality of consultation to make that possible. In particular, in that context, we have been concerned that there should perhaps have been a fuller exploration of the extent to which this draft resolution has bearing upon, and relates to, the established regulations of the United Nations, established pursuant to Article 101 of the Charter, under which the terms of employment and conditions of the staff of the Organization are settled and conducted.

Having made these points, I now come specifically to the text in draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1. My delegation could look upon it with favour if it were to be amended in two places. I am well aware of the rules of the General Assembly with respect to oral amendments. Nevertheless, I hope that what I am now going to present can be given favourable consideration.

First, in the fourth preambular paragraph, there is regrettably no reference to one of the principal organs of the United Nations, an organ the range of which and the work of which are very extensive and are therefore of the deepest interest to so many Member States. I refer, of course, to the Economic and Social Council. I propose therefore to complete this preambular paragraph by adding a reference to the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council after the words "Security Council". The words that would be added would be as follows:

> "and Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish shall be the official languages and English, French and Spanish the working languages of the Economic and Social Council"

and then superscript 3 with a footnote reading "Rule 32 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council". Thus we would follow precisely the same terms as are used in this preambular paragraph in reference to the General Assembly and its Committees and subcommittees and the Security Council, and would simply repeat the exact words that are found in rule 32 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council, with a footnote reference to that effect.

Very interestingly, in addition to the points I have made about the extreme importance to so many of us of the work of the Economic and Social Council, the Council, unlike the other organs cited in this paragraph, provides that Spanish shall also be a working language of that body.

My second proposed amendment is in paragraph 3. Here I would propose that a reference be made to the Charter of the United Nations. I point out that nowhere in the draft resolution is reference made to the fundamental provision of the Charter under which the staff of the Organization are recruited and the regulations to that effect are drawn up. There is a reference to the Charter — not by way of a citation, just to its title — in the second preambular paragraph, after which a contention about multilingualism is advanced. But there is no precise reference to the Charter in the draft resolution. My delegation considers that to be a deficiency that we can readily remedy by adding to paragraph 3, after the words "to ensure that", words referring to Article 101 of the Charter, as follows:

> "appointment of the staff of the Organization shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the terms of Article 101 of the Charter and regulations established by the General Assembly pursuant to Article 101, and that".

I am aware that these are oral amendments. They may need reflection. I would urge all representatives to recognize that they derive directly from the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council and from the Charter of the United Nations. With amendments such as these I believe the draft resolution would be much improved and would certainly then commend itself to my delegation and, I would hope, to others.

The Acting President *(interpretation from Spanish)*: I thank the representative of Australia. His oral amendments will be taken into account and decided upon when we proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1.

In view of the lateness of the hour, the General Assembly will continue its consideration of agenda item 156 this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.

United Nations

A/50/PV.49

General Assembly
Fiftieth Session

Official Records

49th plenary meeting
Thursday, 2 November 1995, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Freitas do Amaral . . . . (Portugal)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Peerthum (Mauritius), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Agenda item 156 *(continued)*

Multilingualism

Draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1

Amendments: A/50/L.8; A/50/L.9; A/50/L.14

The Acting President: I should like to draw the attention of members to document A/50/L.14, which contains the two amendments proposed orally by Australia this morning.

We shall now proceed to consider draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1 and the amendments thereto contained in documents A/50/L.8, A/50/L.9 and A/50/L.14, the last.

In accordance with rule 90 of the rules of procedure, the amendments are voted on first. Rule 90 also stipulates that:

> "When two or more amendments are moved to a proposal, the General Assembly shall first vote on the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original proposal and then on the amendment next furthest removed therefrom, and so on until all the amendments have been put to the vote. Where, however, the adoption of one amendment necessarily implies the rejection of another amendment, the latter amendment shall not be put to the vote. If one or more amendments are adopted, the amended proposal shall then be voted upon."

We shall proceed to take a decision first on the amendment proposed by Malaysia, contained in document A/50/L.9, which is furthest removed in substance from the original proposal. Depending on the result of the vote, we may or we may not vote on the amendment proposed by Japan, contained in document A/50/L.8, and on that proposed by Australia contained in paragraph 2 of document A/50/L.14. We shall then proceed to take a decision on the amendment proposed by Australia in paragraph 1 of document A/50/L.14.

If there is no objection to this procedure, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to it.

It was so decided.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/40/L.6/Rev.1 and the proposed amendments thereto.

I call on the representative of the Secretariat.

Mr. Perfiliev (Director, General Assembly Affairs Division): I have been informed that the adoption of draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1 would not give rise to programme budget implications.

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one month of the date of the meeting*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

The Acting President: Before calling on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the voting, may I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Birenbaum (United States of America): The United States has requested a vote on this draft resolution and will vote "no".

We fully appreciate and respect multilingualism and the importance of providing interpretation and access to United Nations documents in the official languages of the Organization.

We are concerned, however, that the provisions of the resolution before us go beyond accepted concepts of multilingualism within the United Nations system. The text as currently drafted raises a number of issues, not least of which is the fact that it would alter existing rules without following the proper procedures.

The second preambular paragraph introduces the concept of a "corollary" to universality, "multilingualism". To our knowledge, this concept has not been accepted by the General Assembly.

The fifth preambular paragraph is inconsistent with operative paragraph 3 in that it calls for all applicants for United Nations positions to have command of two of the official languages.

Concerning the sixth preambular paragraph, our delegation has noted on several occasions that budgetary constraints impact on all activities of the Organization and cannot be ignored.

Concerning the eighth preambular paragraph, we are not aware of any mandate which requires that the United Nations become in effect a language school for Member States and staff. In fact, the Fifth Committee, the competent body on these issues, awaits a request from the Secretary-General on the United Nations language teaching programme and will then consider the issue.

Concerning operative paragraph 3, we believe that, as drafted, the language would request the Secretary-General to ensure that competence in two languages would be a factor in promotions at all levels of the United Nations. The existing rules on language competence in relation to promotion do not apply to the support staff.

We have concerns regarding operative paragraph 4, which calls for "equality" of the two working languages in hiring and promotions. This represents a new criterion, and we are not clear as to its meaning. We assume that it is not the intent of this language to establish a quota system for hiring much like the geographical distribution system. However, the provision is ambiguous in that regard.

Finally, we note that there has been no estimate of expenditures, as required by rule 153 of the rules of procedure, for this draft resolution. From this we surmise that there will be no expenditure of any kind in implementing the provisions of this draft resolution and that, therefore, all the activities required by this draft resolution can and will be accomplished within existing resources. In our view, a paragraph to this effect should have been included in this draft resolution.

Mr. Yoogalingam (Malaysia): I wish to take this opportunity to appeal to members of the General Assembly to give careful consideration before a vote is taken on the proposed amendment, in document A/50/L.9, to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution in document A/50/L.6/Rev.1.

The draft resolution in that document embodies a concept dear to us all, and would contribute to the promotion of multilingualism in the Organization. However, we are of the view that it would place those countries whose native tongue is not one of the six United Nations languages at a serious disadvantage. It is indeed ironic that, in the quest to achieve parity between the six United Nations languages, those already disadvantaged would be further discriminated against.

We recognize that the revised operative paragraph 3 in document A/50/L.6/Rev.1 attempts to take on board some of the concerns expressed by those countries whose native tongue is not one of the six United Nations languages. However, we are of the view that it does not adequately address our concerns: it is inconsistent with multilingualism and does not safeguard the interests of those whose mother tongue is not one of the six United Nations languages. It would have been helpful if the sponsors of the draft resolution had been prepared to accept the word "encourage" instead of the word "ensure" in the current draft resolution. The word "encourage" is the term used in previous resolutions and is one that could help forge a consensus on this draft resolution.

As we have had insufficient time to consider the draft resolution in question, and we would request the sponsors to exercise patience and understanding for those of us who have serious problems with operative paragraph 3.

Ms. Eerikäinen (Finland): It is a long-standing and firm policy of Finland not to oppose the inclusion of new items on the agenda of the General Assembly. The necessary corollary of this policy is that delegations must be given adequate time and adequate opportunity to study new proposals so that a consensus or a largely satisfactory compromise solution can be reached by Member States.

In this case, those conditions have, unfortunately, not been met. In our view, there would have been room to seek compromise, and further efforts should have been made to see whether the draft resolution on this important item could have been adopted by consensus. It was on this ground, and this ground only, that Finland voted in favour of the motion to defer treatment of this item yesterday, and is also why Finland will abstain in any and all votes on the text of the draft resolution today.

I want to emphasize that our votes yesterday and today must not be construed as being in any way against multilingualism. On the contrary: Finland considers the issue before us to be of great importance to all States Members of the United Nations. Itself a constitutionally bilingual country, Finland values linguistic and cultural diversity and supports strict observance of the rules concerning the equality of the six official languages and of the working languages of the United Nations.

Mr. Ladsous (France) (*interpretation from French*): I have taken the floor in order to ask that members of the General Assembly do not put into effect the amendment proposed by the delegation of Japan or the one tabled by the delegation of Malaysia. In my explanations I will concentrate on the Japanese amendment.

Even before it proposed its amendment, the Japanese delegation asked us for our understanding for the situation of nationals of countries where one of the official languages of the United Nations is not in common use. To require of them, on recruitment, mastery of two official languages, at least one of which must be a working language of the Secretariat, would be likely to cause them serious problems. In fact, the sponsors of the draft resolution, showing great sympathy for the concerns expressed by the Japanese delegation, were won over completely to their point of view. I should like to emphasize that this was not a self-evident step, because it involved giving up an important, innovative element in the initial draft of the resolution, in document A/50/L.6.

We have therefore proposed in the revised draft resolution to return to the legal status quo ante by sticking strictly to the provisions of resolution 2480 B (XXIII) of 21 December 1968, that is to say, in requiring a staff member at the moment of recruitment to be able to use one of the working languages of the Secretariat or one of the working languages of a United Nations organ in the case of staff members recruited for that organ and whose contracts are for no more than two years.

Finally, and also as in General Assembly resolution 2480 B (XXIII), our revised draft resolution calls for the knowledge of a second official language to be taken into account for promotion within and between grades. We therefore believe that the concerns expressed by some Asian delegations have been fully taken into account in the revised draft. The Assembly will understand that the sponsors cannot fall short of what has already been agreed upon in previous resolutions; that they cannot sanction a regression in the existing law. That would clearly be contrary to the spirit of our draft, and it would inevitably comfort and succour the very practices our resolution is intended to condemn.

The amendment proposed by the Japanese delegation is deliberately vague in its wording. A simple encouragement for staff members to use one more official language in addition to a Secretariat working language does not imply any obligation on the Secretariat, and we have a good idea that, in practice, such a formula would have no effect.

Like the amendment tabled by Malaysia, the Japanese amendment opens the door to all kinds of skullduggery with particular reference to the get-out clause for nationals whose mother tongue is not an official language of the United Nations. For all these reasons, and expressing the viewpoint of the sponsors as I do so, I ask through you, Sir, that all delegations vote against both the amendment proposed by Japan and the one proposed by Malaysia.

However, I do find it possible to agree with the two amendments proposed by the Permanent Representative of Australia. I thank him for his two suggestions, which we will be able to vote for.

Mr. Laclaustra (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Spanish delegation wishes to make some brief comments on the amendments put forward by Malaysia and Japan to the draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.6/Rev.1.

My delegation wishes to stress the fact that the sponsors of draft resolution A/50/L.6, inspired by our desire that this draft resolution should reflect, as broadly as possible, the concerns of all delegations with a view to having the draft adopted by consensus, held several meetings with the sponsors of the amendments in order to accommodate their points of view. Consequently, revised draft resolution A/50/L.6 incorporates new drafting in operative paragraph 3 which reproduces resolution 2480 B (XXIII), of 1968. We firmly believe that this new text adequately reflects the concerns expressed to the sponsors. We therefore regret the fact that those behind these amendments are still maintaining them. Consequently, the delegation of Spain will vote against the amendments contained in documents A/50/L.8 and L.9.

On the other hand, my delegation this morning heard the proposal by the representative of Australia, who suggested additions to both the fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1 and to its operative paragraph 3, which have been distributed in document A/50/L.14. We would like to thank Australia for its constructive contributions to our consideration of draft resolution A/50/L.6, and would like to say that we will vote in favour of those suggestions.

Ms. Fernández de Gurmendi (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation wishes to speak on the proposed amendments to the draft resolution on multilingualism: these are the amendments contained in documents A/50/L.8, L.9 and L.14.

As to the amendments contained in documents A/50/L.8 and A/50/L.9, we would like to say that my delegation has a great deal of sympathy for the difficulties faced by people whose mother tongue is not one of the official languages of the Organization, although those difficulties are not substantially different from those faced by most delegations in an Organization which is increasingly locking itself into monolingualism.

Despite our sympathy for these difficulties, my delegation feels that the proposed amendments would modify the existing legal regime for staff recruitment and promotion. We believe that modifications to the complex set of personnel procedures require in-depth study to analyse all the possible consequences, including budgetary ones. My delegation will therefore vote against the amendments proposed in documents A/50/L.8 and L.9.

However, my delegation does welcome the amendments proposed by Australia in document A/50/L.14. Indeed, my delegation would like to thank the Permanent Representative of Australia for those amendments, which significantly improve the text of the draft resolution, and wishes to state that it will vote in favour of them.

Mr. Gervais (Côte d'Ivoire) (*interpretation from French*): Malaysia has proposed that we replace operative paragraph 3 in document A/50/L.6/Rev.1 with an amended one. We think that if we adopt Malaysia's proposal we would be taking a very regrettable step backward, because it would sanction the very monolingualism that our Organization has striven to avoid ever since it was set up. It is imperative that, in our Organization, we must avoid establishing categories of staff members: those whose mother tongue is one of the official languages of the United Nations, and those whose original language is not. And Malaysia's proposal calls on us to do just this.

This kind of discrimination — or disparity — is quite obviously something we should prohibit. Furthermore, how can we incorporate the idea of a mother tongue into a universal Organization such as ours. With regard to African countries — including mine, where we speak almost 40 "mother tongues" — I cannot even begin to imagine how we would slot ourselves into the United Nations framework. Consequently, my delegation cannot go along with Malaysia's proposal, and, with regard to the Japanese amendment, my delegation, while understanding the concerns and worries of that country, does feel that, in any event, it would be a step backwards from what has been built up ever since the United Nations was established.

My delegation therefore cannot accept those two proposed amendments, but I can say that we do accept the Australian proposal in document A/50/L.14.

Mr. Mustafa (Sudan): The delegation of the Sudan would like to join the group of countries sponsoring draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1.

In the meantime, and in conformity with the spirit of the draft resolution before us, we share the deep concern of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions about the possible adverse effect of the proposed abolition of the two Language Coordinator posts from the training programme for all official languages of the United Nations.

To this effect, we recall resolution 42/207 C of 11 December 1987, which affirms that the translation and interpretation budgets of United Nations bodies should be commensurate with needs and should not be subject to budgetary constraints.

Mr. Chinvanno (Thailand): My delegation will be voting against draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1 on agenda item 156, "Multilingualism".

We regret that we must so decide, and that the Assembly is taking this course of action on a very important question involving the whole membership of the Organization. My delegation is disappointed that there has not been an adequate opportunity for the whole membership to discuss the provisions of the draft resolution in order to reach consensus.

My delegation feels compelled to vote against the draft resolution because we still have strong reservations about operative paragraph 3, even with the useful amendment proposed by the Permanent Representative of Australia. The paragraph, in our view, has grave implications for personnel matters. In practical terms, requiring a command of two of the six official languages would place at a serious disadvantage personnel and potential recruits whose mother tongue is not one of the six official languages of the Organization.

Thailand wishes to reaffirm its commitment to multiligualism at the United Nations, and to support the idea that the United Nations should promote cultural diversity; but Thailand believes that the promotion of cultural diversity has as its central ideal the concepts of tolerance and understanding, which, in the context of this agenda item, should be extended to those cultures that, by force of history, are not associated with any of the six official languages of this Organization.

Mr. Dlamini (Swaziland): My delegation wishes to reiterate and reaffirm our observations on both the principal draft resolution and the amendments. My delegation wishes to know, in the first place, why this draft resolution is a necessity. Why are we not directing our energy and time to problems within our nations and, indeed, the world over?

Do we intend to dismantle the principle of solidarity at a time when it a matter of necessity within the United Nations? My delegation feels that this draft resolution discriminates against the developing nations, which otherwise have a legitimate right to have their nationals recruited by the Secretariat.

This draft resolution does not indicate the time-frame for Member States to train their nationals so that they qualify for employment by the United Nations.

The problems that face the United Nations do not have their genesis in the use of a particular language. Why, therefore, and why now, is the Organization being made to think of the very tedious matter of which languages should be used as criteria in recruiting Secretariat staff members?

If I may ask, of these languages, how many will be from Africa, where I come from? Have the sponsors of this draft resolution ever thought deeply, when talking of geographical representation — as enshrined in the Charter — about including developing nations and, indeed, my own continent, Africa? Are we being reminded indirectly of those sad days and times when the very same languages we are speaking today were imposed upon us by those who divided us in Africa and in the developing nations elsewhere? Should the United Nations allow that same spirit to prevail and divide this body too? Should we again be instilled with the spirit of divisiveness that, even today, most nations are suffering from?

What is the role of the United Nations? Is it not to promote peace, unity and solidarity? The colonizers had their own agenda when they imposed their languages on the developing nations, especially in Africa. Thanks to the scramble to colonize Africa, we were divided. Should we allow history to repeat itself today within the United Nations?

My delegation would therefore humbly implore this body to give serious consideration before adopting any such a draft resolution, and implores it especially to allow delegations to consult — formally and informally — so that the United Nations is not seen as playing the role of colonizer among the developing nations.

Mr. Albín (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Mexico is a sponsor of draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1.

For several weeks now, we have been aware of the concerns of some States whose national language is not one of the official languages of the United Nations. In the view of the sponsors, the essential aspects of those concerns have been dealt with in the revised version of the draft resolution, document A/50/L.6/Rev.1. The sponsors have made a genuine effort towards a rapprochement with those countries.

It has been said that the draft resolution would change present practice in hiring and promoting staff members. We are convinced that that is not the case. Paradoxically, the amendments in documents A/50/L.8 and L.9 contain elements that, in our view, would indeed alter the present practice within the Organization if they were adopted.

The sponsors' objective in draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1 on multilingualism is a very simple one, and here I am forced to contradict the representative of Swaziland. The draft resolution has to do with the effective use of the official and working languages of the United Nations. It is a question of restoring a healthy linguistic balance in the use of all those languages. The proposals in the draft resolution, which are by any standards objective and reasonable, would be vitiated by the amendments in documents A/50/L.8 and L.9. My delegation will therefore vote against those amendments.

My delegation can, however, support the amendments proposed this morning in a constructive spirit by the Permanent Representative of Australia and now reflected in document A/50/L.14. The delegation of Mexico calls on the Assembly to vote in favour of draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1 and of the amendments submitted by the Australian delegation in document A/50/L.14, and urges it to vote against the amendments in documents A/50/L.8 and L.9.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

The Assembly will now take a decision on the amendment contained in document A/50/L.9.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Azerbaijan, Barbados, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brunei Darussalam, Croatia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Bangladesh, Belize, Botswana, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Slovenia, South Africa, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia

The amendment was rejected by 88 votes to 37, with 28 abstentions.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the amendment contained in document A/50/L.8.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Croatia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Namibia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Cyprus, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Latvia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Netherlands, Norway, Saint Lucia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sudan, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia

The amendment was rejected by 93 votes to 26, with 37 abstentions.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the amendment contained in paragraph 2 of document A/50/L.14.

May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt the amendment contained in paragraph 2 of document A/50/L.14?

The amendment was adopted.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on the amendment contained in paragraph 1 of document A/50/L.14.

May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt the amendment contained in paragraph 1 of document A/50/L.14?

The amendment was adopted.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now turn to draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1, as amended. A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1, as amended. There being no objection to this request, we shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, India, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire

Against:

Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Croatia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Indonesia, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Malaysia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United States of America

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Belize, Estonia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Latvia, Maldives, Mongolia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Saint Lucia, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1 was adopted by 97 votes to 36, with 29 abstentions.

The Acting President: We now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1 as a whole, as amended.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zaire

Against:

Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Georgia, Indonesia, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Lesotho, Marshall Islands, Namibia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United States of America, Zambia

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guyana, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Latvia, Malaysia, Maldives, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Saint Lucia, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/50/L.6/Rev.1 as a whole, as amended (resolution 50/11) *was adopted by 100 votes to 35, with 29 abstentions.*

The Acting President: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote. May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Mr. Pine (New Zealand): It is with great regret that New Zealand, a multicultural society with two official languages, has found itself unable to support a resolution on multilingualism, a concept that we and every other United Nations Member supports. We are disappointed that a minority of the membership of this body has succeeded in preventing a consensus from being allowed to emerge on this important subject, when 70 Members, from all parts of the globe, had indicated the need for more work to be done.

As the delegate of Malaysia has observed, there is an inescapable irony that on this fiftieth anniversary, in a text that purports to celebrate the diversity of our Organization, we have been unable to accommodate the concern which has been expressed by some of our Members, in particular our friends in the South Pacific and Asia, over the problem faced by countries in which any United Nations language is a second language. This concern has, from the moment it was raised, struck our delegation as genuinely held and reasonable. We remain convinced that, with good faith, it could have been accommodated in the resolution. The fact that it has not been can lead only to the conclusion that some of the sponsors were not really interested in celebrating diversity, but instead were focused only on extending a current privilege at the expense of other linguistic groups that are currently operating in a situation of even greater hardship.

We noted very carefully the statements last night from the sponsors that they did not intend to change the current rules concerning the employment and promotion of United Nations staff. We must admit that this had not been clear to us from the ambiguous language of their draft resolution. Indeed, this was the very reason we had wished further time to negotiate, and the reason we have been unable to support the text before us.

We should like the record of this meeting to reflect the understanding that the current resolution, which has not had the benefit of consideration in the administrative and budgetary Committee, cannot be interpreted as effecting a change in resolution 2480 B (XXIII), including the discretion given to the Secretary-General in subparagraph 1(*b*)(i).

Mr. Kumamaru (Japan): My delegation has been instructed by its Government to make the following statement.

Japan voted against the resolution because its operative paragraph 3 penalizes staff members whose mother tongue is not one of the official languages of the United Nations. Japan finds the paragraph unacceptable. Such personnel, already at a disadvantage, should not be subjected to an additional penalty.

My delegation regrets that no real effort was made to reach an agreement before the draft resolution was put to the vote. Had there been proper consultations in an appropriate committee, this measure would certainly have been adopted by consensus.

My delegation believes wholeheartedly in the importance of preserving and promoting cultural diversity in the Organization. However, it is precisely for this reason that due respect should be shown for those cultures not associated with the official languages of the United Nations.

Mr. Shin (Republic of Korea): My delegation voted against the draft resolution contained in document A/50/L.6/Rev.1. My delegation holds the view that the United Nations should not penalize personnel whose mother tongue is not one of the six official languages of the United Nations. In my delegation's view, linguistic balance within the Organization could be achieved by encouraging Secretariat staff to gain proficiency in at least one more of the other official languages of the United Nations.

My delegation knows that a significant number of Member States have voted against the resolution. It is my delegation's hope that due consideration will be given to this fact in implementing the resolution.

Mr. Drobnjak (Croatia): Croatia would rather have had more time to examine comprehensively this agenda item and undertake further consultations in order to reach a consensus on this important issue.

Croatia firmly supports the principle of multilingualism. For Croatians it has always been necessary to learn languages other than their native tongue in order to be able to communicate with their neighbours and the rest of the international community. However, Croatia is a small country whose official language is not one of the six official languages of the United Nations and whose citizens, prior to applying for a position in the Secretariat, where Croatia is significantly underrepresented, have to learn one of the working languages and continue with studies of the other languages, whether they are employed at the General Service or the Professional level. Therefore, Croatia, bearing in mind the principle of the equality of all United Nations Members, could not support some of the elements contained in the draft resolution that favour some Members over others.

Croatia would also have preferred that the resolution include a request that the Secretary-General take into account the difficulties faced by applicants whose mother tongue is not one of the official languages of the United Nations.

Mr. Katende (Uganda): Uganda encourages the principle of multilingualism in international relations. However, my delegation regrets that we have taken action hurriedly on this matter. In our view, more consultations were necessary in order to adopt a consensus resolution. In particular, there are certain provisions contained in the resolution just disposed of that required further consultations on the part of my delegation. We were denied this opportunity, which is why we abstained in the voting on the resolution.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 156?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.